

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2013

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Doug Kern, (Not present)

Mark Youngkin

4 Eileen Fanelli

Brian Ullensvang

5 Jan Blum

Julian Hultgren

6 Julie Cheever

Gloria Gee

7 Toni Kramer

Edward Callanan

8 Jan Monaghan

John Budroe

9

Special Presentation :

10

Genevieve Coyle

11

---o0o---

12

13

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on January 8, 2013, 7:06 PM at
17 Building 67, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
18 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
19 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
20 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements:	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations:	
7	A. Mountain Lake Project Update	6
8	B. Barnard Avenue Protected Range	13
9	C. Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1A and 2	24
10	5) New Business - None	
11	6) Public Comment - None	
12	7) Action Items and Agenda Items:	30
13	8) Closing:	41
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Welcome to the
2 monthly meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board,
3 Presidio San Francisco Restoration Advisory Board.

4 Does everybody have an agenda? As we've
5 already heard, we're adding a topic.

6 MS. FANELLI: Yes. I'd like to add the
7 Barnard Avenue Protected Range probably to make it B or A
8 or somewhere up there, and Genevieve Coyle is here and
9 she's going to be joining us shortly. She's going to get
10 us information.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Let's put her as B, then.

12 MS. FANELLI: She'll do the Mountain Lake
13 update, too.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: Oh, she will?

15 MS. FANELLI: I have delegated my duties
16 tonight.

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: Any other agenda items that
18 anybody would like to add?

19 Okay. Moving on, announcements.

20 MS. FANELLI: I do want to make an
21 announcement. I'm full of surprises today. I did send
22 an e-mail tonight to the RAB as a whole.

23 There was a -- we're in the process of
24 trying to make sure all of our electronic files and
25 everything are updated, and there was a document that I

1 think we talked about here or I talked about that we had
2 sent in for closure of groundwater analysis on fillsite
3 1, landfill 2, and as I was pulling my files together --
4 we sent it in in the beginning of September -- August,
5 and I realized that the cc push button to the RAB hadn't
6 happened. So I sent that to you today.

7 We have not gotten guidance back from DTSC
8 on it because I think Medi's been busy on Treasure Island
9 and has not paid any attention to it, quite frankly, but
10 I want to let you know that I sent it to you.

11 You may get more of those as we're cleaning
12 out. We're trying to clean out and make sure that we get
13 documents from DTSC. I might find more of those.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: They're recent documents?

15 MS. FANELLI: This one is from the end of
16 August 2012, but we -- I thought we had sent it, but we
17 hadn't.

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Moving on to topic
19 4, discussions and presentations.

20 MS. FANELLI: Okay. She's coming. Let's
21 see. I can give you a little bit of update on.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: Start with Mountain Lake,
23 then.

24 MS. FANELLI: Genevieve's the project
25 manager for Mountain Lake. I'm going to let Genevieve go

1 into details, but you will be getting the quarterly
2 report for -- next week for activities through September,
3 and so next month, I could do the quarterly reports
4 updates.

5 And -- and with that, I'm going to let
6 Genevieve go into Mountain Lake and for BAP.

7 MS. COYLE: Actually, I don't have
8 drawings on Mountain Lake. Yes, I do. You should all be
9 on the public notice for -- for public -- yeah.

10 So we're going to try to send these e-mail
11 messages out every time we have some activity or
12 something changing and just so keep folks in the loop,
13 which is a good way of disseminating information.

14 And if any of you have been out there,
15 these signs have been up for about a month now for
16 letting people know that this is happening.

17 So we just started mobilizing equipment
18 into the site last week, which is good news.

19 So over the next few weeks, you'll start to
20 see more and more activity down there, job trailer's
21 going to come in this week.

22 So in a couple of weeks, we will be ready
23 to start actual construction which will be grading the
24 staging area in the north -- to the north of the lake as
25 well as the Eastshore Trail that is our access to the

1 lake.

2 And then in later January, we expect to
3 actually mobilize the barge and dredge equipment into the
4 lake so you'll see a number of boats in the water at that
5 time.

6 And then that will enable us to start --
7 there's two phases of the construction. First is there's
8 a number of down tree logs in the bottom of the lake that
9 had sort of blown in from that western shore in the past
10 that we need to move before we dredge.

11 So we're going to be kind of picking up
12 debris from the bottom of the lake and removing that from
13 the lake as well as the perimeter areas. We have to
14 remove tule reeds that are around the east shore -- east
15 and northern shore of the lake.

16 So we're going to be doing that work in
17 February, and then once that -- the lake's sort of ready
18 and clear for dredging, then we'll start the dredging
19 process, and we expect to start that in March and go
20 through the summer.

21 So you'll see more and more activity
22 building up there in the next few months.

23 In terms of impacts to the public, we're
24 hoping that, you know, we've got people notified now that
25 there will be closures.

1 We're really trying to avoid closing that
2 trail around the lake, but it will need to be closed on
3 days where we're hauling material, where we're doing too
4 many activities there, but we've got this map out for
5 folks to get around the area.

6 I'm not sure -- we don't need to --

7 MS. FANELLI: The boat launching will
8 happen at night, so Caltrans is cooperating, working very
9 closely with us, and they are going to facilitate using
10 their contractor, lane closures and traffic controls when
11 the barges do go into the water.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: So it's going to go from
13 Highway 1 to the playground?

14 MS. COYLE: That's why we're doing it at
15 night. It takes a lane closure. We're using a crane and
16 a number of equipment.

17 It's going to be an ordeal to get all of
18 the boats and get all of the equipment into the lake.
19 The beach will be closed itself, so you'll still be able
20 to walk -- I'm going to show you.

21 You'll be able to walk along Mountain Lane
22 Trail here. You'll actually get a good vantage point.
23 You just won't be able to use the stairs and the path
24 down to the beach just for safety.

25 Once we're doing work in the water, we

1 don't want the public or dogs getting in the water.

2 And then we'll be closing a trail here on
3 days that we're using equipment as well as on West
4 Pacific on this end.

5 So -- yes. So it's moving along and we'll
6 start to see activity, which is really good.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: So where's the truck route
8 now?

9 MS. COYLE: The truck route the still the
10 same as in the RAP. What will be happening is we'll have
11 the dredge operating in the water.

12 It will pump via pipeline -- from the
13 dredge, it will go directly into a pipeline. The
14 pipeline will go into the trail here and up to the
15 staging area, and then get processed or dewatered here,
16 and then when it is ready to be off-hauled, we're going
17 to use the golf course route.

18 So it's going to be at Mountain Lake Trail,
19 under the freeway, around here and up through Park Avenue
20 back and forth.

21 So we won't be using West Pacific Avenue
22 because the beach is a very heavily traveled route.

23 MS. BLUM: Genevieve, how are you
24 collecting storm water that's going into Mountain Lake
25 now or is it same business as usual?

1 MS. COYLE: We have taken action in the
2 staging area. There's a lot of exposed area. We do have
3 storm water controls here to direct everything into the
4 storm water piping as well as on the east shore,
5 controlling runoff.

6 But it will be business as usual. There
7 are storm water pipes here, the one to the north arm as
8 well as ones going into the lake.

9 We were going to be putting in filters as
10 catch basins. That was done by Caltrans last month.
11 Those are all installed now. Whatever storm water runoff
12 that was going into the lake is now being captured.

13 MS. BLUM: Did they widen the road where
14 they have their equipment? It seems like there's an
15 extra lane on there now where they're parking all that
16 heavy duty equipment.

17 Was that shoulder always there?

18 MS. COYLE: It was always there, yeah.
19 They definitely didn't expand it. I haven't driven up
20 there to see sort of the visual changes as you drive.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: I think it was overgrown a
22 lot.

23 MS. BLUM: Maybe that's what it is.

24 MS. COYLE: A lot of the trees were
25 overhanging. That probably made a visual difference.

1 MS. BLUM: Yes.

2 MS. COYLE: To give you an update on
3 Caltrans work, Caltrans, as you probably know, are done
4 with the stone column installation.

5 They were now in the process of laying the
6 bumping for the future storm water diversion in the
7 roadway. They should be done with that by the end of
8 this month.

9 And then the last phase of work for them is
10 to restore the slope that we removed -- they removed all
11 the vegetation, so that slope will be restored and
12 planted.

13 So we're expecting to plant that in the
14 spring 2013. So you'll start to see the trees and other
15 native plants getting planted, so we'll try to build up
16 that buffer again.

17 MS. KRAMER: And the plants chosen for
18 that, any idea will they get high enough to hide the
19 roadway?

20 MS. COYLE: Yes. They are I believe shore
21 pines. They're going to come in. So when they're
22 planted, they're going to be seven to eight feet high,
23 and then they'll continue to grow, as well as willows and
24 shrubs that eventually will come back in.

25 That was definitely one of the big

1 considerations, use that as well as a sound barrier.

2 Fill that back in.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Are all the animals out of
4 the lake now?

5 MS. COYLE: So, yes. So our natural
6 resource department has been collecting fish out of the
7 lake and transporting them to a refuge facility up in
8 Sonoma.

9 I think they've actually made really good
10 progress because the numbers have gone up dramatically
11 which they're hoping means that they've actually caught a
12 lot of the fish.

13 So they're still out there doing that.
14 We're not sure how many -- it's a difficult process. I'm
15 not sure yet how far along they are or will be, but
16 they're continuing that, and they will continue the fish
17 removals until -- internal removal until we're ready to
18 go with dredging.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any questions on
20 Mountain Lake, comments?

21 Great. Amazing to see it actually starting
22 after all these years.

23 MS. COYLE: Yeah.

24 MS. BLUM: Long time.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: Let's move on to Baker

1 Beach -- BAPR, I guess.

2 MS. COYLE: So I have some maps for you.
3 I made up five copies, so you can kind of share them.
4 It's a packet of two different maps. I'm going to pass
5 them down and share. Yes. Two different maps.

6 MS. CHEEVER: BAPR.

7 MS. COYLE: This is Barnard Avenue
8 Protected Range. So Barnard Avenue Protected Range which
9 we know as BAPR is the low lying drainage area which is
10 north of landfill E.

11 This area was a historic firing range that
12 was built about 1907, and we don't know when it was -- we
13 think about 1940s is when use of the firing range
14 stopped.

15 And then landfill E material was placed on
16 top of the firing range.

17 So what this map is showing you is this
18 green sort of dashed area -- actually this sort of ivory
19 off-white area down here is the north part of landfill E.

20 MS. BLUM: North part of landfill E.

21 MS. COYLE: So this is landfill E. This
22 is Barnard Avenue coming in and then it gets to a dead
23 end where the walking trails start.

24 So this is the slope of landfill E here,
25 and this is the drainage of landfill E shown here in

1 light blue.

2 MS. BLUM: Where's the housing? I think
3 I'm upside down on this map.

4 MS. COYLE: The housing is here.
5 Buildings 808, 809 and 810 are housing, and this is
6 Quarry Road.

7 When you drive down Barnard Avenue towards
8 landfill E, which is Pop Hicks Field --

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MS. COYLE: -- to your left is vegetation
11 and a drainage and it's very heavily vegetated in that
12 area. This is the area we're talking about.

13 You know what? I can just grab the report
14 really quickly.

15 MS. BLUM: Which way do you drive on
16 Barnard Avenue? This way?

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: This goes to the loop and
18 go back across the creek and back.

19 MS. COYLE: You can pass this one around.
20 This shows you the old firing range fan here.

21 The area of BAPR that we're discussing is
22 the area that's not underneath landfill E. So the range
23 targets were under landfill E and those were closed with
24 landfill E, the cover, and then there was -- the firing
25 line and northern portion of the BAPR which was not part

1 of the landfill E remedial action, so that's the portion
2 of the BAPR left that the topic of the new remedial plan.

3 So this -- so you can see the range span
4 here at the northern end of the range fan was, where the
5 line of fire was and they shot into the union from the
6 south.

7 You can see the range fan on here.
8 Everything north of this green line is the area that has
9 not been closed. Everything underneath -- not underneath
10 landfill E.

11 And so this area was investigated. You can
12 see all of the sample points on this map, over an area.
13 The Army collected a few samples as part of the RI
14 sampling, and the Trust has done a few rounds of
15 different investigations to look for firing range
16 contamination here.

17 What we found is that we did not find any
18 firing range contamination. We didn't find any bullets
19 or sort of evidence of the former use of the firing
20 range, but what we did find in this drainage area is
21 evidence that landfill E runoff likely spilled into the
22 drainage here, which makes sense because this was the
23 drainage from landfill E over the years.

24 And so the chemicals of concern are not
25 just firing range contaminants. They're the same -- a

1 lot of the same COCs that were found at landfill E,
2 antimony, copper, lead, zinc, which are all metals, TPH
3 is diesel, which is petroleum and some pesticides,
4 chlordanes D, E and DDT.

5 What this map is showing you in the color
6 zone is the different land uses, which is one of the kind
7 of struggles with this site is that there's areas of
8 sensitive ecological uses and there's areas of landscape
9 and housing. So we do -- have applied different cleanup
10 levels.

11 This dark green area to the east -- to the
12 west -- sorry, is ecological sensitive area, but not
13 within a drainage.

14 The light blue areas where we have sediment
15 and drainage from the former landfill E, and then to the
16 west, sort of the lighter blue -- I'm sorry. East. I'm
17 getting mixed up -- is the landscaped area for
18 residential housing. So we have different cleanup levels
19 that apply in this area.

20 And so what we found is that these
21 contaminants are posing a risk to the ecological
22 environment based on sediments cleanup levels as well as
23 special status cleanup levels.

24 The plans for this area -- it's very
25 heavily vegetated right now. Our plan under the BMP is

1 to repopulate it with native plants and also maintain a
2 lot of the old redwood trees that are in the area.

3 So, as you probably know, we did take out
4 trees last -- in November and December. So we've done
5 tree removals in this corridor in anticipation for the
6 Remedial Action Plan. So the -- it's clear and ready to
7 go.

8 We're going to be releasing a RAW. So in
9 this case, you're used to the term RAP, which is Remedial
10 Action Plan. In this case, we're doing a Remedial Action
11 Workplan, so it's a RAW.

12 The reason the distinction there is just
13 because this is a small removal action that is less than
14 two million dollars.

15 We go through a slightly different
16 regulatory process. It's still a public document. It
17 gets released for a thirty-day public comment period, but
18 it's kind of more of a streamline document rather than a
19 larger RAP.

20 This document we are planning to release
21 later this month or in early February for a thirty-day
22 public comment period.

23 We looked at three different alternatives.
24 We looked at no action, capping in place, which would be
25 as you know bringing in soil, two feet of soil and

1 capping it, and removal, which is excavation and
2 disposal.

3 We did the alternative analysis and the
4 remedy we're proposing is excavation, disposal on that
5 drainage.

6 It would be covering an area of about -- if
7 you flip to the next map, you can see the excavation
8 boundary. About a half an acre.

9 It's a very shallow excavation which makes
10 sense because if this material came from landfill E, it's
11 just sediment that's kind of washed down and deposited on
12 the surface.

13 The excavation will be a half a foot to one
14 and a half feet, about 1,300 cubic yards of material. So
15 it's very small for -- you know, in terms of our program
16 here.

17 And the cost is 450,000. The CEQA
18 documentation as part of the RAW as usual, instead of
19 preparing a full initial study, what we did is a Notice
20 of Exemption, which is for small removal actions costing
21 less than a million dollars.

22 It's a little bit more streamlined, but
23 you'll still -- if you look at the CEQA notice exemption,
24 you'll still see sort of an analysis that you'll see on
25 the study. It's just compacted into a public document,

1 which is easier to get through than an initial study.

2 Also the work plan includes how we're going
3 to implement the removal action. So it talks about the
4 truck routes and where we're going to stockpile soil and
5 gives more detail on that process.

6 And like I said, DTSC is expecting that
7 we're going to be releasing the document later in January
8 or early February for a thirty-day public comment period.

9 Assuming that that gets approved in
10 February or March, we're prepared to do the cleanup as
11 soon as possible.

12 The biggest concern with this site is that
13 it's in the drainage and it gets very, very wet during
14 the rainy season.

15 So if we have a really rainy season, we're
16 likely not going to be able to do it until summer, but
17 we'll try to get in there as soon as possible. It's only
18 going to be a two-week cleanup. So it's pretty fast.

19 MS. FANELLI: And you -- last month I
20 showed you the photographs of tree removal from that site
21 and we've taken a lot of the ivy off the bottom of the
22 trees that are surrounding.

23 So when we go to grab that, we're not
24 pulling stuff off of the trees, and we're also removing
25 bird nesting habitat, as well as low-lying bird nesting

1 habitat.

2 And I think the plan in the long run, as
3 Genevieve said, with the trees, which are part of the
4 historic forest, I believe is are going to stay there,
5 and native plants will be planted at some point in the
6 future.

7 But in this particular case, I think
8 Planning has asked to hold off on significant replanting
9 of the drainage until they complete further and broader
10 plans, but it will of course be buttoned up and stable
11 for the winter rains.

12 We had good check of our current erosion
13 controls because we had some heavy rains, as you know, in
14 November and December, and the site performed very well.

15 So we're pretty pleased about that, but it
16 also gave us some additional information to button up the
17 site whether we're done with it next year.

18 But the concept is it will be a little bit
19 broader and wider flat area to facilitate wetland
20 establishment in that area, maybe a little bit of ponding
21 so that Natural Resources can facilitate getting some
22 wetland volunteer plant growth in that area.

23 MS. BLUM: I was in that area I think
24 middle of last week and I noticed there was minor erosion
25 from all the rain that we've had at the toe of landfill

1 8.

2 I'm not sure I'm using the right term, but
3 toward the rain garden -- above the rain garden toward
4 landfill E.

5 Nothing really serious, but the water
6 continues to pour through that area.

7 MS. FANELLI: Well, quite a bit of water
8 comes off of landfill E and that's why we ended up
9 putting a fair amount of rock to take that energy, and
10 there's no plants in that yet.

11 If I notice, we planted the face of
12 landfill E, the face and we planted the western channel
13 and the southern portion, but we didn't plant the toe,
14 and we did that on purpose. We don't want to rip it up
15 to finish Barnard Avenue.

16 So that toe area is a little bit more area
17 to pipe close, and particularly we had a lot of mulch.
18 It will be planted at the same time we finish and button
19 up on the Barnard Avenue Protected Range, and those
20 plants have already been propagated by the nursery.

21 We actually are taking care of them as a
22 nursery in Berkeley. So they're under special care until
23 we're ready to plant them, which will hopefully be
24 October/November of next year.

25 MS. BLUM: Genevieve, did you say that

1 there are trees in the area that are going to be
2 excavated, and then if so, my question is: How do you --
3 I think you said you're going to take out half a foot to
4 a foot and a half of material.

5 Are you going to work around the tree
6 trunks by hand or how are you going to do that?

7 MS. COYLE: We actually worked with our
8 forester and Natural Resources Department to determine
9 which trees should go which ones should go and which ones
10 should stay.

11 They did a survey of that area and flagged
12 the trees that were unhealthy, that needed to go quickly
13 versus ones that they wanted -- they have a long-term
14 strategy of leaving in place until some native plant
15 restoration is done in the future.

16 So we did clear a corridor of trees through
17 the middle of this drainage.

18 So there is going to be a combination of
19 areas where we can do the excavation by traditional back
20 hoe because there's no trees, but whenever we're within a
21 twenty foot radius of a tree, which is basically within a
22 root zone, then we're going to use special methods to get
23 around the roots of the trees, which is a combination of
24 like vacuum and other kind of --

25 MS. FANELLI: Sort of like air spades and

1 hand digging.

2 MS. COYLE: Hand digging. It's technology
3 that we use a lot for the lead-based paint work around
4 houses.

5 There's a lot of utilities. You can get in
6 and around these utilities without having to remove them
7 or damage them.

8 So we're going to use this technology
9 around these roots. The good thing is that because it's
10 only a foot and a half, you can do that in the shallow
11 excavation. You couldn't do that obviously where we're
12 going any deeper than a foot and a half.

13 So what's going to happen is once we're
14 done with this initial cut that's shown on the figure,
15 collect confirmation samples.

16 If it looks like we're going to have to
17 over-excavate in an area, we'll continue to use that
18 technology until it's unsafe or unhealthy for the tree.

19 Then we have to make a decision do we leave
20 the tree because this is an ecological value that we're
21 trying to protect or remove additional trees. We're
22 really hoping not to take out more trees in that area.

23 MS. KRAMER: And then you'll replace new
24 topsoil over that?

25 MS. COYLE: Yes.

1 MS. KRAMER: It's really only a foot and a
2 half deep?

3 MS. COYLE: Yeah.

4 MS. BLUM: Amazing.

5 MS. COYLE: It kind of makes sense. If
6 you think of it washing off landfill E, it's not
7 something like a fillsite that's filled in like a big
8 hole. It's really just the surface.

9 We did see -- we've sampled down to three,
10 five feet in some of these areas. We see dramatic
11 difference what's in the upper foot versus the rest.

12 MS. FANELLI: So hopefully that will be
13 out soon, and George Chow is the project manager at DTSC
14 that will be handling this.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any questions,
16 follow-up questions, comments?

17 Okay. Moving ahead. We've got one more
18 topic left, Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1A and 2 FS/RAP
19 comments.

20 So we're in the public comment heard now
21 and the public meeting is tomorrow night. If anybody
22 wants to show up in person and make comments, Golden Gate
23 Club, six o'clock.

24 Is that right?

25 MS. COYLE: I think it's seven o'clock.

1 MS. FANELLI: Seven o'clock.

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: Seven o'clock. One of the
3 small rooms on the side.

4 MS. COYLE: Yeah. I think it's the
5 typical one that all of ours have been. If you walk in,
6 it will be either on the left or the right, but probably
7 the left. I can't remember which one.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: There's really nothing
9 going on right now during the comment period? It's
10 pretty much on hold, sort of?

11 MS. FANELLI: No. We're continuing with
12 our design and compliance. We're working with the Park
13 Service on NHPA compliance, et cetera. So we're working
14 independently to move the process forward.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: DTSC is just not
16 participating.

17 MS. FANELLI: No. DTSC's has not
18 participated in any of that at this point because they
19 haven't approved the FS/RAPs yet.

20 We're working internally on the compliance
21 issues with Park Service in particular, engineering
22 issues that we need to resolve.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. We have a draft of
24 technical comments out from John.

25 Do you want to say anything about that,

1 John?

2 MR. BUDROE: Got some comments back and
3 we'll be doing some minor wordsmithing in response to
4 that, but no major changes in the comments.

5 So if anybody's got -- I presume everybody
6 got them --

7 MS. MONAGHAN: I got them.

8 MR. BUDROE: Excellent. If you got any
9 comments on them, feel free to send them back to me, and
10 general comments that we're going to package.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yeah. And so I can put
12 together a cover letter like we usually do and then fill
13 in general comments for the cover letter.

14 So we can start discussing those tonight or
15 you can send them to everybody by e-mail. Of course you
16 can send your own comments in, too, if you would prefer
17 to do that.

18 But I'll go back through my notes I guess
19 and kind of pull out some general comments from our
20 discussions. Unless anybody can think of them right off
21 the top of their head.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: I'll dig them up. I read
23 this. I understand what you're trying to say even though
24 you used all of the big words.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yeah. So maybe it would be

1 good to sort of paraphrase or summarize what John was
2 saying in some of those technical comments, too.

3 We can work on that in the next couple
4 weeks.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

6 MR. YOUNGKIN: Start sending those around
7 as they come in and go out.

8 MS. CHEEVER: The cover letter won't have
9 signatures on the RAP. It will say: "The following
10 people"?

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Good question. We've done
12 it both ways in the past. Sometimes I just sign it
13 representing the group or we can have individual
14 signatures from people who actually send in the comments.

15 I think what we've done the last few years
16 is sort of put the letter together and then we won't have
17 a meeting to vote on it.

18 So send it around, just get general
19 concurrence that everybody's happy with it, and I would
20 just sign it as a representative of all of us.

21 We can do it either way unless you'd prefer
22 to have individual signatures on it.

23 MS. CHEEVER: That's good. What does HERO
24 stand for?

25 MR. BUDROE: Health Ecological Risk --

1 MS. FANELLI: Office.

2 MR. BUDROE: They changed from HERD.

3 Health and Ecological Risk Division. Now it's Health and
4 Ecological Risk Office.

5 MS. CHEEVER: It's part of DTSC?

6 MR. BUDROE: DTSC, yeah.

7 MS. FANELLI: Kimi Klein's group.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Anybody else planning on
9 attending the public meeting tomorrow? You're going to
10 be there.

11 MS. BLUM: That's it? Everyone?

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: I'll try to make it.

13 MS. BLUM: It's going to be lonely and
14 cold in there.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: They stay there a certain
16 time?

17 MS. FANELLI: Well, I believe DTSC's doing
18 a presentation like they have on the past, but I don't
19 think it's super long. I hope it's not super long
20 because we have to sit there, too. It's not as warm a
21 building as this one is.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Who from DTSC's making the
23 presentation?

24 MS. FANELLI: I believe it is Lori, who's
25 the PM for Baker Beach 2, and Bob who's been doing PM

1 work on 1A.

2 MS. BLUM: Bob Boggs.

3 MS. COYLE: And the public.

4 MS. FANELLI: Radhika.

5 MS. COYLE: She will start and end the
6 presentation.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay.

8 MS. BLUM: So they have a public meeting.
9 If the public didn't show up?

10 MS. FANELLI: Yes. They'll just note that
11 there were no comments received.

12 MS. BLUM: Okay.

13 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure they'd do the
14 presentation for the sake of us.

15 MS. COYLE: I don't think they would do
16 the presentation. We would show up with the
17 presentation, but we wouldn't do the presentation.

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. So I'll start on the
19 cover letter and send me your comments as you come up
20 with them.

21 I did talk to Doug briefly, so he's
22 interested in putting some comments in, too.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: We'll see what we can get
25 from him.

1 Any other comments, questions, ideas Baker
2 Beach Disturbed Areas?

3 Okay. Great. New business. Item number
4 5. Anybody have any new business?

5 Public comment.

6 Action items and agenda items. We have
7 quarterly report for next meeting.

8 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

9 MR. YOUNGKIN: When does the comment
10 period close on Baker Beach?

11 MS. COYLE: February 5th.

12 MR. BUDROE: February 5th.

13 MR. YOUNGKIN: February 5Th. I guess we
14 can talk about the letter that goes out for members who
15 don't get a chance to see it before it goes out, I guess.
16 It will go around by e-mail, but I can bring a hard copy
17 in.

18 MS. CHEEVER: What's the date of our
19 February meeting?

20 MR. YOUNGKIN: The second Tuesday in
21 February.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: After, yes.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: It will be after the close
24 of the comment period.

25 MS. FANELLI: It's the 12th. It's a RAB

1 meeting. We should be in BAPR comment period time, then.
2 So you can talk about that if it all goes well.

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: And what's the time period
4 on the BAPR RAW?

5 MS. FANELLI: We don't have a firm date,
6 but we're hoping to get it around in the next -- by mid
7 to late January. That's the Trust objective.

8 We think it's basically ready to go. We're
9 just putting the -- polishing it with DTSC and then it
10 should be issued.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. So we have the
12 quarterly report as an agenda item for the February
13 meeting, follow-up for the Baker Beach Disturbed Area
14 comment letter.

15 Any other topics? I guess the BAPR, I
16 guess, would be a good one for that.

17 MS. FANELLI: So now if it's out, DTSC
18 will probably decline to come again because it will be a
19 public meeting, but we're hoping that it's out.

20 It needs to be out because it's on a
21 critical path for us to get design documents again,
22 contractors assigned.

23 Even though it's small, we still don't have
24 any more time. We have less time. We had hoped that
25 this would have happened before the holidays. We hoped

1 this would have happened last fall, but it didn't. So we
2 are a little backed up.

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay.

4 MS. BLUM: Mark, just to follow up on an
5 action item, I did write to Saul Bloom and asked him if
6 he knew of remediation final reports, but I haven't heard
7 back from him, and I know he's probably busy.

8 So I'm wondering if -- do you want me to
9 continue asking him or we could ask others or what do you
10 want to do about that?

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Interesting, yeah. I've
12 never heard of a final report from a RAB, so --

13 MS. FANELLI: I think you guys should be
14 the first.

15 MS. BLUM: Wouldn't Congress?

16 MS. FANELLI: You know, locally, I would
17 wonder if DTSC would know.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: They're done at each
19 base. So --

20 MS. BLUM: At each base. So it is a
21 federal situation.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: I think the probably would
23 be closing ones.

24 MS. FANELLI: I'll ask our contacts at the
25 Army. Maybe Bruce can direct me to somebody who might

1 know if there's been any done for any other sites.

2 I would think that DTSC should know, too,
3 because they're overseeing base closures in California.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: California, yeah.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Isn't the EPA overseeing
6 some of them?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Both.

8 MS. BLUM: Who?

9 MS. CHEEVER: EPA. They're some Superfund
10 sites, and the EPA.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: So you can follow up with
12 Michael Work.

13 MS. BLUM: He used to come to our
14 meetings, didn't he?

15 MS. CHEEVER: I once on the Internet found
16 a site somewhere in the Department of Defense that
17 explained RABs.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

19 MS. CHEEVER: So there might be a human
20 being somewhere who might know.

21 MS. FANELLI: So the question that -- I'm
22 hoping -- I think it would be great if the RAB did a
23 summary report of their own participation and activities
24 and looking for any example documents that might be done
25 by other RABs.

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: I would be surprised if you
2 would find anything myself, I think.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: But you might also --
4 Saul used to have some staff working that might be a
5 little less busy than he is.

6 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yeah. Going directly to
7 Saul the --

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Pretty hard. Just call
9 their general office number and see.

10 MS. BLUM: That's a good idea.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Does Michael Work still
12 work at the EPA?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: The last I heard, he
14 does.

15 MS. BLUM: That was a long time ago.

16 MS. FANELLI: Genevieve pointed out --
17 Cooper's back at the EPA and I don't know if he has
18 access or research that --

19 MS. COYLE: He's a Superfund project
20 manager there. He can disseminate.

21 MS. BLUM: I can send them an e-mail; see
22 if I get a reply.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: I wouldn't be surprised if
24 we're just on our own on this. As far as a RAB final
25 report. We can probably find other final reports.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: You could probably find
2 other RABs that have finished their work and contact
3 them.

4 MS. BLUM: That's what I was hoping for.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: Some of the EPA will tie
6 you together to EPA offices and you might be able to
7 query that way.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: You need to find a RAB that
9 wasn't shut down for some reason, that actually finished.

10 MS. FANELLI: The Presidio is a place for
11 firsts and it makes sense that this RAB would be a first
12 in completing their business and preparing a report
13 documenting what they did.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: We'll think about this,
15 too. Cooper might be a good.

16 MS. BLUM: So that's local. That's right
17 here.

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. We're just wrapping
19 up. Yeah. We went through our items fast.

20 MR. CALLANAN: I'm sorry I missed it. I'm
21 sorry I missed the last couple meetings, but I'm getting
22 around better.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Good. Any comments you'd
24 like to make?

25 MR. CALLANAN: Having heard nothing, I

1 can't comment.

2 MR. YOUNGKIN: We covered the Mountain
3 Lake project. There's a figure of it over there. It's
4 just particular kicking off. They're doing the staging
5 area prep and the roadway.

6 They're going to bring the barge in --

7 MR. CALLANAN: Oh, really?

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: -- and put it in the water
9 next month.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: End of this Monday.

11 MS. COYLE: Hoping by the end of this
12 month.

13 MR. CALLANAN: Yeah, because I've been
14 interested in that since I came on.

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Caltrans just finished
16 installing the stone columns and putting in the catch
17 basin filters, I guess they call it.

18 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: And now they're laying pipe
20 for the future storm water diversion.

21 MS. COYLE: Yes.

22 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: And then once they put the
24 boat in, they're going to start dredging in February
25 sometime and they'll go --

1 MS. COYLE: Not dredging in February.
2 We're going to be doing the log removal, material removal
3 and tule removal.

4 MR. YOUNGKIN: There's some trees laying
5 on the bottom they have to take out first. Then dredging
6 will start up in March.

7 MS. FANELLI: There will be some more
8 archaeological work with tule removal. Archeologists
9 will be onsite when they're pulling the tules, and I
10 forget whether it's a shore that has not been arranged
11 historically, so there could be Native American or early
12 American --

13 MS. COYLE: Yeah. The previous concern
14 ecologically was whether there was more deposit and over
15 time down six feet, but the current concern as closer as
16 we get to the edge, of the east arm in particular that
17 there could have been settlement and likely use of the
18 water source that there would be along here, and this is
19 the old, you know, boundary of the lake.

20 Now the northern boundary has changed
21 because the lake used to be expanded up here, but this
22 east shore really hasn't changed.

23 So the concern is once we do tule removals
24 and go into this little piece right here, that we might
25 uncover artifacts.

1 MS. FANELLI: And that tule removal is not
2 for remediation. I want to just make sure. That's work
3 that the Trust is taking on to further the enhancement
4 plan for the lake.

5 So it's part of the ecological enhancement.
6 So it is being funded separately, although we're helping
7 manage that process because it's going to be done
8 concurrently with the remediation piece.

9 But that is work that's coming out of the
10 National Resources Department in particular.

11 MR. CALLANAN: Is Caltrans cooperating?

12 MS. FANELLI: They are. They are, and --
13 I mean, I feel that we have a very good working
14 relationship with Caltrans, particularly on the technical
15 staff level because usually technical people just want to
16 do their jobs, and once the legal issues are settled,
17 then that makes it much easier for the technical people
18 to go about doing their jobs.

19 So at this point -- you meet with them.

20 MS. COYLE: We were meeting twice weekly.
21 Now we're meeting once a month. But we're in continual
22 communication, coordinating.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Then we talked about the
24 Barnard Avenue Protected Range project, which is sort of
25 kicking off right now with the release of a Remedial

1 Action Workplan, a RAW document which is coming out in
2 February for comments, totally comment.

3 MS. FANELLI: Maybe the end of January.

4 MS. COYLE: Hoping January.

5 MS. FANELLI: We're putting pressure on
6 DTSC.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: That's what these are
8 about. It's basically the excavation of contamination
9 that's come down from landfill E.

10 So they're going to be digging a foot and a
11 half, a foot and a half a foot, take off the topsoil
12 contaminated with metals, pesticides.

13 MS. COYLE: TPH.

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: Diesel, petroleum, metals
15 and pesticides in this area.

16 So they've taken the trees out, done some
17 vegetation removal. And then replant it with wetland
18 community native plants.

19 Then they're going to try to leave in large
20 redwoods, dig around the roots. That's on sort of a fast
21 track, expedited process. It's under two million
22 dollars.

23 MR. CALLANAN: What's the time on that?

24 MR. YOUNGKIN: It's not going to take very
25 long, is it?

1 MS. COYLE: The actual cleanup will take
2 about two weeks. We'll get the majority of the material.

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: In the spring sometime, I
4 believe.

5 MS. COYLE: We're hoping spring if it's a
6 dry winter, and as you know, the amount of water coming
7 off of landfill E. If it's too wet, we can't get in
8 there.

9 MR. YOUNGKIN: We have to follow the rain
10 and weather conditions to see when they can get in and do
11 that excavation.

12 We finished up with a discussion of the
13 Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1A and 2, the ones we've been
14 talking about for about the last six months or so.

15 It's been quite a while, and we have a
16 comment letter in progress. We have technical comments
17 that have circulated by e-mail. You might have seen
18 those.

19 Then we're going to do a cover letter to go
20 on those technical comments with more general comments,
21 sort of pull from our notes and discussions the last
22 three or four months, and we're going to try to finish
23 those up by -- February 5th is the due date.

24 So we'll be circulating that around by
25 e-mail and take a look at it. If you have any comments

1 on that, you can respond to that. They'll come in to me.

2 And then we were just going off action
3 items and agenda items, any more action items and agenda
4 items for next month.

5 We've got the quarterly report, BAPR, the
6 public comments, we can talk about any comments we have
7 on that, and then a follow-up on the Baker Beach comment
8 letter.

9 Great.

10 MR. CALLANAN: Sorry for keeping you all.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Might as well just come the
12 last five minutes every meeting.

13 Any other comments, questions?

14 Okay. Without objection, meeting
15 adjourned.

16 (The meeting concluded at 7:56 PM).

17 ---o0o---

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2013.

17

18

19

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

20

21

22

23

24

25

CLEANUP PLAN FOR BAKER BEACH)
DISTURBED AREAS 1A and 2)
_____)

PUBLIC MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2013

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 PRESENTERS AND PANEL

2

3 RADHIKA MAJHAIL - Public Information Specialist
Department of Toxic Substances Control

4

5 LORI KOCH - Project Manager
Department of Toxic Substances Control6 ANGELA LIANG CUTTING - Project Manager
Department of Toxic Substances Control

7

8 EILEEN FANELLI - Program Manager
Presidio Trust

9

---o0o---

10

SPEAKERS

11

Page

12

MS. RADHIKA:

3, 16

13

MS. KOCH:

8

14

15

16

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

17

MS. PEARSON:

18

18

MS. CHEEVER:

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the Meeting, and on January 9, 2013 at 7:07 PM at the Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of California, there commenced a Public Meeting under the auspices of the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Page 2

1 MS. MAJHAIL: Good evening, everybody.
2 I'm Radhika Majhail and I'm with the Department of Toxic
3 Substance Control. I'm the Public Information Specialist
4 for Presidio project and I welcome you all tonight here.

5 The purpose of today's meeting is to go
6 over the cleanup plan for the Baker Beach Disturbed Areas
7 1A and 2, and before I go into any more details on the
8 project, I want to quickly do some housekeeping.

9 The bathrooms are back on the left. The
10 far end would be the door right here, the three doors,
11 and there is a sign-in sheet, and I recommend you to sign
12 in in that sheet because we will be sending out a copy of
13 the presentation via e-mail.

14 Please make sure we have your e-mail
15 addresses here.

16 Also, during the presentation, I would
17 request you to hold your questions till the very end, and
18 then we can have a question and answer round for
19 clarifying questions for the presentation.

20 Today is a formal meeting, so we have --
21 are here to take your comments, and when I open the floor
22 for public comment period, you will have an opportunity
23 to say an oral statement comment.

24 But if you want to give me your written
25 comment, that's accepted, as well, today, and we have the

1 court reporter here, so if you need to add a comment
2 or -- during the public comment period, please say your
3 name, first name and last name clearly so we have it for
4 the record.

5 So let me go over the agenda real quick. I
6 will introduce you to the project managers for this
7 project, and after that, we will be covering the DTSC
8 site cleanup process. I'll explain how DTSC works and
9 what is the cleanup process.

10 After that, we'll have presentation by Lori
11 Koch, who's the DTSC project manager, and she will talk
12 about the site location, background, investigations, risk
13 assessment, remedial alternatives and the proposed
14 remedial action, and she'll talk about CEQA, which is the
15 California Environmental Quality Act, and will also go
16 over with you the public comment period.

17 So for this project, we have here -- as you
18 know, we're going over two sites here, the Baker Beach 1A
19 and the Baker Beach 2.

20 So the project manager for DTSC for Baker
21 Beach 1A is Bob Boggs. Unfortunately, he's not here
22 today with us, he's sick, but he's still the project
23 manager, and we have today here Lori Koch who will be
24 going over both the presentations and she's a project
25 manager with DTSC, and we also have Eileen Fanelli, who

1 is supervisor for -- Presidio Trust program manager here,
2 and also have Angela Liang Cutting, who is Presidio Trust
3 project manager.

4 So let me go over real quick about the site
5 and how we do the site investigation of the cleanup
6 process.

7 The site discovery is the first step where
8 DTSC becomes aware of a site, if the site comes to our
9 knowledge, and after that, we do some research and we
10 we'll go on to the next stage, which is called a
11 Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Phase.

12 In this phase, the big question that we ask
13 is: Is cleanup necessary? Do we need to find out if
14 there are risks associated? And how do we -- should we
15 go further or not?

16 And while that is going on in the public
17 participation area, we develop a cleanup profile and we
18 also work on the public participation plan.

19 Both these documents are going to parallel
20 with whatever is going on.

21 These documents actually give us
22 information about the community around the site, tell us
23 the issues or any -- any community interest that would be
24 with the site or the cleanup. So we get to know all the
25 issues and the concerns of the community.

1 After that, we move on to the Remedial
2 Investigation phase or it's called the Feasibility Study.
3 In this stage, the big question that we ask here is: How
4 much is the contamination?

5 We're trying to find the extent of the
6 contamination and to know what is here and find out how
7 to -- what is contamination, how much it is, what is the
8 nature of the contamination, and then we write our
9 cleanup plan.

10 And then today we are here in this phase.
11 We're at the public meeting and we're discussing the --
12 the Draft Remedial Action Plan, which is also in the
13 short, we call a Draft RAP.

14 This is just a name for a cleanup document
15 that we're talking about these sites.

16 Before becoming -- before today, we have
17 sent out a fact sheet that we mailed out regarding the
18 Draft RAP that talks about the alternatives. It talks
19 about the proposed alternatives and other background of
20 the site, as well.

21 So after tonight, after we get the
22 comments, today and after the public comment period ends
23 on February 5th, we will respond to those comments, and
24 if there's any changes that needs to be made to the Draft
25 RAP, we'll do that, and after that, we'll finalize the

1 document, and then it becomes the Final RAP at this
2 point.

3 Similarly, the same situation, the CEQA
4 document, which is also for public review right now, will
5 Also be finalized at the same time.

6 Then we move on to the design phase. Here
7 we put the details on how we're going to clean up, and
8 all the engineering details are put into picture here.

9 After that, we will do an implementation
10 phase where the actual ground work, physical things
11 happen.

12 Here the work is done, and after
13 implementation, DTSC will -- they certify it. If the
14 formal work is done, everything is done, then we certify
15 the site, and then we move on to the O&M, or the
16 operation and maintenance phase.

17 This is the -- if there is any more
18 maintenance that needs to be done over time -- over a
19 period of time after implementation, then that is done in
20 this particular phase.

21 So this is the basic structure that we
22 follow for cleanup at DTSC.

23 Now I'm going to hand over the floor to
24 Lori Koch who will go over with you the ID and other
25 presentation.

1 MS. KOCH: Thanks, Radhika.

2 As Radhika said, my name is Lori Koch. I'm
3 project manager with the Department of Toxic Substances
4 Control. I'm also a civil engineer. I'm the project
5 manager for the Baker Beach Disturbed Area 2 project, but
6 my colleague Bob Boggs is sick tonight. I'll be talking
7 about both sites.

8 So the Baker Beach disturbed areas are on
9 top of the bluff at Baker Beach. This is on top of the
10 bluff. They're south of the Golden Gate Bridge, which is
11 up here and west of Highway 101.

12 There's a little map here that shows the
13 Presidio and the locations of the two sites, and the
14 Presidio -- if you get a chance to walk up here and look
15 at it, you'll get better picture of where the sites are.

16 West of the two disturbed areas are sea
17 bluff floats and then there's the Pacific Ocean.

18 So the sites are in an area that is managed
19 by the Park Service. The land use now -- and is
20 anticipated in the future -- is recreational, hiking,
21 bird watching, that -- that sort of thing.

22 The vegetation in the area is maintained by
23 Park Service employees and volunteers. And that's
24 anticipated to be the future use, as well.

25 So Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1A, the north

1 area here, is west of the historic Battery Cranston and
2 Marcus Miller, and that disturbed area contains asphalt,
3 bricks, tar permeated sand, and the asphalt there in
4 front of the batteries appears to be from the asphalt
5 roofing material that may have eroded from the tops of
6 the batteries.

7 Then Disturbed Area 2 just down here is
8 west of Battery Godfrey, which is right here. It's a
9 debris filled area which contains a mixture of soil,
10 construction debris and other miscellaneous debris. Next
11 slide.

12 So at Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1A, there
13 were six different phases of investigation that were
14 conducted from 1992 to 2010, and our Remedial
15 Investigation Report summarizing the results of those
16 investigations was approved by the DTSC in July of 2012.

17 Where the asphalt roofing material was
18 found on the ground surface, soil samples showed elevated
19 levels of what are called polycyclic aromatic
20 hydrocarbons or PAHs. Those are chemicals that are
21 typically associated with asphalt.

22 The extent of the soil was determined or
23 defined based on the concentrations of pH benzo[a]pyrene and
24 visibility asphalt material on the ground surface, and
25 the affected area covers about two acres to a depth of

1 about 4.5 feet.

2 At Baker Beach Disturbed Area 2, four
3 phases of investigation were conducted between 1992 and
4 2011, and these investigations are summarized in a
5 Remedial Investigation Report approved by us in May of
6 2012.

7 And the sampling showed metal, PAHs -- just
8 metals and PAHs in the soil.

9 The PAHs are likely from asphalt material
10 and the metals are maybe from construction debris or fill
11 soil and rock that replaced it.

12 The extent of the debris fill at Baker
13 Beach Disturbed Area 2 is about .7 acres and extends to a
14 depth of about 12.5 feet. Next slide.

15 So in order to evaluate what needs to be
16 done on the site, the risk to human health was evaluated
17 for each site based on concentrations of the chemicals
18 and the expected site uses.

19 What was found was that the PAHs at both
20 areas pose a low risk to -- under the current use
21 scenario, which is volunteers and recreational users.

22 However, for the site specific reasons and
23 environmental management, DTSC requires action to be
24 taken to protect future uses of the site.

25 An ecological risks assessment was also

1 performed for those sites, and it was found that -- well,
2 first let me back up a second and explain the
3 different -- why we have two different cleanup levels
4 here.

5 There are different habitats at Baker
6 Beach. There's a special status zone where sensitive --
7 special status species occur, and then there's what's
8 called the buffer zone, which is a land use area that has
9 special status, and I think this is it.

10 This -- this line shows approximately the
11 separation between the two different zones, and you can
12 see that part of the area is on the -- the special status
13 zone, which is to the west.

14 MS. HEASSLER: That's actually the trail.

15 MS. KOCH: Oh, the trail.

16 MS. HEASSLER: This special status zone
17 includes the bluff slope and the ecological buffer zone,
18 which is landscaped area usually around -- around the
19 battery and areas that aren't native.

20 MS. KOCH: I just wanted to give an idea.
21 This isn't an exact line, but I wanted to give you idea
22 that there's a special zone to the west and the
23 landscaped areas were to the east closer to the developed
24 areas.

25 The different cleanup areas were developed

1 for the special status zone and the buffer zone.

2 Copper, lead, silver and zinc were
3 pesticides that posed a risk to ecological receptors in
4 Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1A, and silver and zinc posed
5 a risk in the buffer zone, and similar -- similarly for
6 Disturbed Area 2, the same levels posed a risk to the
7 ecological receptors here in the special status zone, and
8 there were potential risks in the buffer zone.

9 So there is a risk of -- of the future use
10 scenario for ecological receptors at the two sites. Next
11 slide.

12 So in order to protect human health under
13 future site uses and to protect ecological receptors, a
14 Remedial Action Plan was prepared, and the Draft Remedial
15 Action Plan that we're talking about today present the
16 evaluation of the alternatives to address the site
17 impacts and propose a preferred alternative for each
18 area.

19 So for each area, four alternatives were
20 evaluated. The no action alternative is -- was
21 considered to compare to the other alternatives.

22 Alternative two, the land use controls.
23 Uses of the site that would pose a risk to human
24 receptors would be prohibited.

25 Fencing and signage would be constructed to

1 limit access to trails only, and maintenance workers and
2 volunteers would have to wear -- would have training on
3 how to wear protective equipment when they're out there
4 working in the area.

5 Under alternative three, the contaminated
6 material would get transported offsite for disposal.

7 Alternative four at Disturbed Area 1A would
8 include removal of the asphalt, the material that's on
9 the ground surface and placement of clean and porous
10 fill.

11 And Disturbed Area 2, alternative four
12 would include replacement with clean fill on the cover.
13 Next slide.

14 So DTSC is proposing alternative three for
15 both sites. In alternative three is excavation,
16 basically.

17 Excavation is protective of human health
18 and the environment for the land use and habitat
19 restoration.

20 Removal of the asphalt material in
21 contaminated soil for Baker Beach 1A and the debris fill
22 in area 2 provides the highest level of protection for
23 human health and environment.

24 At 1A, approximately 4,400 cubic yards of
25 asphalt debris and soil will be excavated and transported

1 offsite to the landfill, covered by confirmation sampling
2 and backfill and clean soil.

3 At area 2, approximately 6,700 cubic yards
4 of debris fill would be excavated and transported offsite
5 for disposal in landfills, again followed by confirmation
6 sampling and backfilling with clean soil.

7 And both sites following restoration will
8 be restored consistent with Park Service planning
9 documents. Next slide.

10 Okay. This slide shows the remediation
11 project area for Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1A. This
12 line shows the area that is proposed for excavation.

13 And from this site, the vehicles would haul
14 the excavated material to a landfill, probably using
15 Merchant Road, which is right here, to Highway 101 south.
16 Next slide.

17 And this is 2, the project area for
18 Disturbed Area 2 here, and the truck would take a similar
19 route south on 101 to the landfill off Lincoln Boulevard.

20 Okay. Next slide. So as part of this
21 process of proposing a remedial alternative, the
22 California Environmental Quality Act requires the DTSC to
23 consider the environmental consequences of the project
24 that we undertake.

25 So the DTSC prepared an additional study

1 that evaluated environmental impacts of the remedial
2 actions that were proposed, and this initial study
3 included in the FS/RAP document that is now available for
4 public review and comments. It's one of the documents
5 that -- it's I guess included with the FS/RAP.

6 So the DTSC has determined in the process
7 of doing the initial study that the proposed remedial
8 action will not result in any significant impact to the
9 environment, and as a result, we are recommending a
10 Negative Declaration as far as this project.

11 So during the design phase for the project,
12 plans will be prepared to protect the site workers, the
13 community and environmental implementation of the action.

14 So the kind of plan that will be prepared
15 are health and safety plan, air monitoring plan, traffic
16 control plan, storm water pollution prevention plan, and
17 also there will be dust monitoring ongoing throughout the
18 implementation, and there will be project signage and
19 notices to communicate with the public and outreach as
20 needed.

21 We anticipate that there will probably be a
22 public information coordinator onsite as needed to
23 provide information to the public during the excavation
24 process.

25 One more before I pass it back to Radhika.

1 This is our tentative schedule. The public
2 comment period is happening now and it's -- it's going to
3 close on February 5th.

4 Following the closing of the public comment
5 period, we'll finalize the Remedial Action Plan,
6 hopefully in February, and then the remedial design in
7 spring with the remedial action happening this year.

8 I call Radhika back up.

9 MS. MAJHAIL: Thank you, Lori.

10 Let me go over the public comment period
11 one more time. Public comment period is running as of
12 now. It was a sixty-day public comment period and ends
13 on February 5th.

14 So once we receive all the comments, we
15 will generate a Response to Comments document and then
16 those -- that document will be available and the
17 information in repositories and also copies will be sent
18 out to the people who comment at that time.

19 We have two repositories. The one at the
20 Berkeley office of DTSC and the other one in the Presidio
21 Trust Library. So these are the locations, and also we
22 have online repositories.

23 For DTSC website, we have areas that you
24 can go and take a look at all the site documents, and
25 also at the Presidio website, as well.

1 Project contacts. These are the contacts
2 for people that you can contact at any time for this
3 project, and also for information on where to send your
4 comments. Feel free to grab a fact sheet from the back.

5 There is information on how you can send in
6 your comments. So you can take a look at that.

7 And before I open the public comment period
8 here, let me ask if there are any questions that -- any
9 clarifying questions for any of our project managers
10 here.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Hi. I have a very minor
12 question about PAHs. One of the tables mentions
13 polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons and yet elsewhere it's
14 polycyclic.

15 Is there a difference between the two?

16 MS. KOCH: No difference. Just different
17 nomenclature. Different conventions about how to talk
18 about them, describe them.

19 The nuclear -- polynuclear reverses the
20 nucleotides, the patterns, the molecules. So it's the
21 same thing as polycyclic.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Thanks.

23 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay. Any other questions?

24 No. Then I'm going to open the floor for
25 public comment. Please remember this is a formal public

1 comment period. If you want to state your comment,
2 please state your first and last name and then you can
3 state your comment.

4 Do you have a comment, anybody?

5 MS. PEARSON: I'm Marilyn Pearson. I've
6 been here at the public meetings before about disposal of
7 problem areas in the Presidio.

8 Some have been very controversial, and
9 there was a lot of comments made about if these things
10 which we're concerned about the potential hazard of them
11 are on the road going to wherever the landfill is.

12 What is -- where do they go? Who makes
13 sure that at the new spot, it's not creating a new
14 problem for the area where they're dumped?

15 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay. Thank you. We'll
16 note your comment and respond to it in the response to
17 comment document.

18 Any other comments? Yes.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Well, I'm a member of the
20 Public -- a resident of San Francisco and I also am a
21 member of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. My
22 name is Julie Cheever, C-h-e-e-v-e-r.

23 So our group, the Restoration Advisory
24 Board has been discussing this for a while, and I feel
25 like I'm still in the process of studying it and will be

1 making a comment with other members of the RAB.

2 But preliminarily, I want to say I'm very
3 pleased that excavation is the proposed remedy.

4 I am among those who care very much about
5 the fact that this is an -- area A is part of a national
6 park, a spectacular site that is going to be dedicated to
7 the public for decades, both these, and we hope centers.

8 So I am among those that think there should
9 be the very strictest standards of cleanup for something
10 that's been part of a national park and very beautiful
11 place.

12 In my study so far -- as I mentioned, I'm
13 very pleased about excavation being the remedy, but I --
14 I have a sense that at sometimes there's been a decision
15 point in developing the remedies between a very -- a very
16 conservative approach another approach that's
17 conservative, but a little bit less conservative, and
18 this might apply both in screening out certain PAHs and
19 risk assumptions about how often people are going to be
20 there, whether they're volunteers or people using the
21 trails to pass either possibly through or right behind,
22 and even exposure for, say, children versus adults.

23 I hope -- the comments that I have will be
24 more developed later, but I just want to mention that I
25 have a concern that I think that for these sites in a

1 national park, if there is a decision point, the decision
2 should go to the more conservative, more stringent
3 because of the importance of these sites.

4 MS. MAJHAIL: Thank you for your comments.
5 Any other comments? No?

6 Okay. Then hearing no more comments, I'm
7 going to close the meeting, and if you have any other
8 questions after we close the meeting, we'll be here, but
9 at this point, I'm going to take the meeting off the
10 record.

11 Thank you very much for being here.

12 (The meeting concluded at 7:34 PM).

13 ---o0o---

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

1 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

2

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
4 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
5 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
6 full, true and complete record of said matter.

6

7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
8 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
9 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
10 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
11 action.

11

12

13

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____day of _____,
2013.

14

15

16

17

18

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

BARNARD AVENUE PROTECTED RANGE (BAPR))
DRAFT REMOVAL ACTION WORKPLAN (RAW))
_____)

PUBLIC MEETING
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2013
GOLDEN GATE CLUB
PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 PRESENTERS AND PANEL

2

3 RADHIKA MAJHAIL - Public Information Specialist
Department of Toxic Substances Control

4

5 GEORGE CHOW - Project Manager
Department of Toxic Substances Control6 GENEVIEVE COYLE - Project Manager
Presidio Trust

7

8 ---o0o---

9

SPEAKERS

	Page
11 MS. RADHIKA:	3, 12
12 MR. CHOW:	8

13 QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

14 MS. SARA SEGAL:	13
15 MR. PETER BUXTUN:	14, 19
16 MS. KEVIN DAVIDSON:	17
17 MS. JAN MONAGHAN:	19

18 *** There were no public comments

19 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
20 of the Meeting, and on February 12, 2013 at 6:07 PM at
21 the Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco,
22 California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527,
23 State of California, there commenced a Public Meeting
24 under the auspices of the Department of Toxic Substances
25 Control.

Page 2

1 MS. MAJHAIL: Good evening, everybody. I
2 am Radhika Majhail, Public Specialist for the Department
3 of Toxic Substances Control Toxic Substances Control for
4 the Barnard Avenue Protected Range.

5 Today we are here to discuss the cleanup
6 plan, which is the Draft RAW. That's the Draft Removal
7 Action Workplan for this site.

8 If you see the word that's not a Draft RAP
9 like we've been used to in other cleanup, and it's a
10 Draft RAW, and the basic distinction between a Draft RAP
11 and a Draft RAW is that if a cleanup is under two
12 million, it's a RAW.

13 It's just a terminology that we use, and if
14 it's over two million, it becomes a RAP like we've had in
15 the past, but it still has the only -- all the other
16 consequence are the same. So let's move on.

17 Today I have here with me George Chow, who
18 is DTSC Project Manager for this project, and Genevieve
19 Coyle from the Trust. She's the project manager from the
20 Trust.

21 George will be presenting today, and -- and
22 he will be giving you the details on the site, site
23 location, background, details of the cleanup plan and
24 explain the alternatives discussed in the plan.

25 And I will do the site cleanup process.

1 I'll give you a generic overview of DTSC's cleanup
2 process.

3 After the presentations, we're going to
4 have a question and answer round, and that question and
5 answer round is pretty much for clarifying questions.

6 If you have any questions regarding the
7 site or any clarifying questions, you may ask at that
8 time, but if you have public comments that you're going
9 to make today, I would ask you to hold those comments
10 till we go into the public comment period round.

11 I will announce that it's time for public
12 comments, and then you may come up here or speak from
13 there.

14 Very clearly, you should say your first
15 name and the last name, because it's a formal meeting,
16 and we will be recording your comments. So the court
17 reporter will take your first name and the last name and
18 then your comment.

19 You can also leave your comments in
20 writing. If you don't want to speak up here, you can
21 leave them in writing, as well.

22 So let's go on to the DTSC cleanup process.
23 The first stage in the cleanup process is the site
24 discovery stage. That is the stage when we become aware
25 of the site, that we as a department become aware of the

1 site.

2 From then, after that stage, we move on to
3 the preliminary assessment stage. This is the stage
4 where we start doing research which we do some tests, and
5 basically the big question we ask here is: Is cleanup
6 necessary? Do we need to do something or we don't need
7 to do something?

8 So that is the question we try to answer
9 here in this stage.

10 Along with the technical side in doing the
11 assessment, the public participation side is busy doing
12 the community profile, and the community profile is a
13 document that usually tells us about the -- the needs of
14 the community, the issues they might have or any of the
15 concerns they might have.

16 We get -- we get those and we put them into
17 the community profile. We also list the public
18 participation activities that will be used during the
19 project.

20 From here, we move on to the public
21 participation plan phase. Public participation plan is a
22 in-depth plan of the public participation, so it's
23 actually a little version of the community profile, a
24 pretty big portion of community profile.

25 It talks about the concerns and the issues

1 and any problems or any concerns they might have with the
2 cleanup or going through right now, we explain it there
3 and we describe all the public participation activities
4 that we'll be doing during that time of the cleanup.

5 So the next stage comes here is the
6 Remedial Investigation and the Feasibility Study phase.
7 In this phase, the technical side will correct the site,
8 and the big question that we ask here at this stage is:
9 How much is the contamination?

10 So we're trying to size the contamination.
11 We're trying to see the extent, how far it is, where it
12 is and we go -- all of the detailed analysis is done
13 here.

14 After that analysis, after we deal with the
15 contamination is how much is the extent, a proposed
16 cleanup plan, a draft is proposed, a Draft Cleanup Plan
17 is proposed, and in this case, it is the proposed plan.
18 We call it the Draft Removal Action Workplan or the Draft
19 RAW.

20 After that is proposed, we have a public
21 comment where the Department puts the document out for
22 public review and starts the comment period.

23 Somewhere in the middle of the public
24 comment period, we do a public meeting, just like we're
25 doing it today. It's just a public meeting where we will

1 be discussing the plan. We'll go over what's in the
2 plan.

3 Once that is done, once we receive your
4 comments tonight and we wait till the end of the public
5 comment period, once we receive the comments, then the
6 Department, in association with the Trust, will respond
7 to those comments.

8 Once the responses are done and the agency
9 reviews them, then we finalized the cleanup plan.

10 So now instead of the draft, it will become
11 a Final Plan. So it will be a Final Removal Workplan for
12 it to be a Final RAW.

13 And after that, the next step is the
14 Remedial Design Phase. In the design phase, what we do
15 is we start putting -- we start thinking about the
16 engineering details, how will we be doing the work. What
17 type of engineering we need. It's all those details
18 going into the design.

19 The next stage is the Remedial Action
20 Stage. In this stage, we implement all those plans, all
21 the engineering details that we put to paper so far,
22 we -- we start putting them in physical ground.

23 So we start moving things and we start
24 cleaning up, whatever needs to be done, we do it in the
25 Remedial Action Phase.

1 So after this phase is complete, we are
2 done with site, we move into the operation and
3 maintenance phrase and O&M, we call it.

4 The site that are not cleaned up to the
5 residential level, we they usually have some control or
6 operation and maintenance, that we need to maintain
7 certain things, we need to check for certain things after
8 a period of time.

9 That is when after the cleanup, we move
10 into that stage, but for this site, we are not going to
11 have an O&M time.

12 Once that is done, all the documents are
13 reviewed, we have done all the work, then we certify the
14 site and then it's -- it's the closure of the site.

15 So now I'm going to have George Chow, DTSC
16 Project Manager, to come and talk about the site, the
17 details and give his presentation.

18 MR. CHOW: Hi, everybody. My name is
19 George Chow, Project Manager for DTSC on this. So this
20 is just a map of the Presidio. You can see the BAPR is
21 right here, right next to landfill E.

22 We know that the BAPR used to be a small
23 arms firing range for the Army used in the early 1900s.
24 In the southern portion of the firing range, it was
25 covered with fill associated with landfill E, and that's

1 already been remediated through the landfill E project in
2 2011.

3 The next slide shows it bigger with more
4 details about the site. As you can see, landfill E's to
5 the south, and today we're really talking about what's
6 inside the green dotted lines.

7 So the site's been broken down into three
8 general areas. There is the western upslope area, which
9 is mostly forested. The eastern upslope area has some
10 residential buildings, and then there's the Tennessee
11 Hollow Drainage in the middle where water runoff from the
12 south flows through the site. So the blue arrow shows
13 the direction of runoff from landfill E.

14 So more than 85 soil samples have been
15 taken across the site so far, and from those soil
16 samples, these are the chemicals of concern that have
17 been identified.

18 They include metals, pesticides and diesel.
19 While we know that the site used to be a small arms
20 firing range, the investigation didn't result in finding
21 bullet fragments or munitions debris or even high lead
22 levels that you usually might find with firing ranges.

23 But the chemicals of concern at the BAPR
24 are the same chemicals of concern from landfill E, and in
25 the BAPR, these chemicals of concern are heavily

1 concentrated within the drainage area.

2 So this leads us to believe that the likely
3 source of contamination here is from runoff from landfill
4 E before it was remediated.

5 So now landfill E's been remediated and
6 runoff goes around the site and we have clean soil or
7 clean material.

8 So based on a comparison of the
9 concentrations to green levels, the soil here causes low
10 risk to human health, but the concentrations do exceed
11 green levels for ecological receptors.

12 So in other words, the soil might pose a
13 risk to plant or wildlife at the site, and again, these
14 are the chemicals of concern. There's antimony, copper,
15 lead, zinc, chlordane, DDT, DDE and diesel.

16 So the Draft RAW considers three
17 alternatives. The first option is to do nothing. The
18 second option would be to cover the contaminated soil
19 with clean soil, and the third option would be to
20 excavate the contaminated soil and backfill it with clean
21 material.

22 So excavation would be protective of the
23 environment, and it costs about the same as the soil cap
24 and has about the same construction impacts.

25 So the Draft RAW suggests that the

1 preferred alternative here is to do the excavation and
2 offsite disposal.

3 The proposal focuses the excavation on the
4 drainage area, and it covers -- the proposed excavation
5 will be about half an acre and half the volume of about
6 1,300 cubic yards.

7 After the soil gets removed, confirmation
8 samples will be taken to ensure that our cleanup
9 objectives are met before we fill it back in with clean
10 soil.

11 And the trees that currently exist within
12 the excavation zone won't be harmed by this project
13 because there will be special techniques used in the
14 excavation to not damage the roots.

15 So the next slide shows the details of the
16 excavation plan. You can see the outline of the area
17 that's planned to be dug up, and the depth of the
18 excavation is going to vary up to 1.5 feet below the
19 surface.

20 This project is expected to take about four
21 weeks and is going to start as soon as April if weather
22 permits.

23 So now Radhika will come and tell you what
24 the next steps in this process are.

25

1 MS. MAJHAIL: Thank you, George.

2 The next steps are again as I told you
3 today the public meeting night where we will be taking
4 public comments, and it does not end today here. You can
5 also send in a written comment if you like till February
6 27th.

7 So the public comment period ends on
8 February 27th. You can e-mail us or postmark your
9 comments till February 27th to us.

10 Once that is done, we will generate a
11 Response to Comments document, and that document in that,
12 we will be responding to the comments in written.

13 So today if you're presenting your comment,
14 we'll just record it, we'll just accept it. We will not
15 be responding to it today here, but we will have a
16 written response generated when we do the -- the
17 document, the Response to Comments document.

18 And after that, the copies of those
19 documents will be sent to the commenters and would also
20 go to the information repository, and in the next slide,
21 I'll show you where the repositories are.

22 After that, the project signage, work
23 notices and other outreach will continue -- will continue
24 on depending on the project stages and where we are.

25 So usually the work notices, whenever we

1 get into the Remedial Design Phase, when the work will
2 start, work notice will go out to the affected community
3 telling them what to expect, what is the time, when will
4 it start and other detail in the work notice.

5 So here are the two information
6 repositories. One is at the DTSC office in Berkeley and
7 the other one is at Presidio Trust Library here in San
8 Francisco.

9 So you can access those documents related
10 to the site at these places, but you can also access them
11 online on DTSC Envirostor database and also at the
12 Presidio Trust's website.

13 Here is the project contact information.
14 You can contact me, George or Genevieve and you can send
15 your comments to any of us.

16 Now I'm going to open the floor for
17 clarifying questions. If you have any questions so far
18 regarding the presentation or in general, we can answer
19 those.

20 Yes.

21 MS. SEGAL: I have a question for George
22 on the cleanup where he said the construction techniques
23 will be preserve the trees.

24 It does like there's one thatch of trees in
25 the affected area that is not identified to be preserved.

1 Are you going to do something about that
2 area?

3

4 MR. CHOW: Well, I said that all the trees
5 that exist there right now will remain according to the
6 plan and I don't know if between the publishing of that
7 figure and now any trees have been taken out.

8 MS. SEGAL: Okay. So the assumption is
9 that more trees will be removed.

10 MS. COYLE: Yeah. There -- there was some
11 area within the excavation area -- area back in November.
12 Those trees were not planned to be preserved. We took
13 out those trees as part of remediation.

14 The remaining trees will be preserved
15 because they're healthy trees.

16 MS. SEGAL: What kind of trees?

17 MS. COYLE: Redwoods.

18 MS. SEGAL: Thank you.

19 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay. Any other questions?

20 MR. BUXTUN: Yes, sir. I probably have
21 half a dozen questions. First of all, are we talking
22 about the site that is occasionally referred to as the
23 California Highway Patrol shooting range?

24 MS. MAJHAIL: No.

25 MR. BUXTUN: Are there several shooting

1 ranges? I know there was the California Rifle and -- the
2 San Francisco -- Presidio Rifle and Pistol Club which is
3 in a building. I think the building is still there.

4 That is a different problem -- that's the
5 same problem in a different location, but the real thing
6 I'm getting at is -- I got late notification of this
7 meeting and persons dealing with these problems of old
8 shooting ranges should know that there are a few
9 corporations, companies that regularly mine these
10 locations and pay for what they take out.

11 In other words, they'll come in, do the
12 entire cleanup according to specifications. They get the
13 metal, which is largely copper and lead and some brass,
14 and they pay the location for the right to do the mining.

15 Are we aware of that?

16 MS. MAJHAIL: Genevieve or Trust, do you
17 have any --

18 MS. COYLE: We're not aware of mining
19 companies. We do -- under the remediation program, we do
20 hire contractors.

21 MR. BUXTUN: I do have a hearing problem.

22 MS. MAJHAIL: Do you want to come up?

23 MS. COYLE: Under the remed -- sorry. So
24 as part of the remediation program that this work is
25 being conducted, we do have contractors who implement

1 these type of excavations where they do dig up soil and
2 bring it to an appropriate landfill, and then as far as
3 your question about this being a CHP range, this is a
4 different site, so -- this is a different site from the
5 CHP range.

6 The CHP range is located in a different
7 area of the Presidio.

8 MR. BUXTUN: I beg to tell you I'm hardly
9 able to hear you.

10 May I just continue a little bit?

11 There are two different places handling
12 things. You can go into federal funds or city funds,
13 whatever, and get money and pay someone to do this.

14 There are a lot of contractors who are very
15 happy to go in and being paid to take dirt away and put
16 it in a safe place, particularly if it's toxic.

17 Of course we're dealing with the water
18 runoff and we do know that there are creeks here that run
19 directly into the bay.

20 So it is a major issue, and I'm just saying
21 if you will give me three days and a person to contact, I
22 will -- well, it will probably be Monday before I can get
23 back to somebody.

24 I'll come up with one or two of these
25 companies in, I assume, the Bay Area.

1 I do not know this. I'm not familiar with
2 these companies, but I did get time yesterday to e-mail
3 to a few people and a friend of mine knows about this and
4 will inform me on it.

5 If you would like to give me somebody's
6 card, I will contact them by Monday about this. Instead
7 of spending money out of the budget, let's get money into
8 the budget and get the same effect.

9 MS. COYLE: Okay.

10 MS. MAJHAIL: We can do that. Thank you.

11 MR. BUXTUN: Thank you.

12 MS. MAJHAIL: Any other questions? Yes.

13 MR. DAVIDSON: Through the past
14 remediation of landfill E and into the current area,
15 since the damage is done through runoff, are there -- is
16 there any other danger that the runoff has infected an
17 area outside of the current area of issue that we'll have
18 to relook at in the future and have to do with the
19 process over again?

20 MS. MAJHAIL: George, do you want to
21 answer?

22 MR. CHOW: Well, landfill E is cleaned up
23 at this point, so the runoff currently runs over clean
24 material and won't carry any contaminants downstream.

25 MR. DAVIDSON: Yeah, I'm sorry. What I

1 was worrying about is since the new area of interest is
2 contaminated, but there is -- there is a flow through
3 that area.

4 Correct?

5 MR. CHOW: Right. So you're talking about
6 what's downstream of this site.

7 MR. DAVIDSON: Correct. Downstream or
8 adjacent to it. We all know that water just doesn't run
9 in a straight line. It will -- it will spread out like a
10 spider, as well.

11 MS. MAJHAIL: Genevieve.

12 MR. CHOW: I don't really have an answer
13 for that.

14 MS. COYLE: I point you to this map here.
15 This map shows you all of those orange dates are all of
16 our sample locations.

17 So we didn't just have -- collect tables
18 along the drainage. We actually collected samples
19 throughout that whole region, and what we found is that
20 the concentrations of contaminants upslope of that
21 drainage area are low and below are cleanup levels for
22 ecological and human health.

23 So we have done very comprehensive testing
24 of that whole area.

25 In addition, as part of the excavation, we

1 collect samples. So once we dig to the limits identified
2 of the figure investigations, we'll go ahead and collect
3 more samples and then we potentially overexcavate if we
4 continue to find contamination. So that assures you us
5 that we've got everything.

6 MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you.

7 MS. MAJHAIL: Yes.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Won't you do ongoing
9 monitoring after the cleanup, as well, for a while?

10 MS. COYLE: So water monitoring is not
11 part of the Barnard Avenue Protected Range RAW site
12 because the contamination is limited to -- to shallow
13 soil and sediment.

14 However, water is sampled as part of
15 landfill E in that region, and the landfill E monitoring
16 wells and seep monitoring points are at the toe of the
17 landfill.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

19 MS. MAJHAIL: Okay. Any other questions?
20 Yes.

21 MR. BUXTUN: Has anybody made a listing of
22 the known streams that used to be used as water supply
23 down the bottom of the hill here?

24 The people who lived here over a hundred
25 years ago would regularly take water out and drink it,

1 and I have heard many stories of people who were here in
2 World War II and later before the Sixth Army closed down
3 the area, and I've heard stories of all kinds of
4 pollution, including something very interesting.

5 Until two years ago, I know, that if you
6 entered on your computer "Presidio, nitrogen mustard
7 gas," you would come up with a small clipping from the
8 Chronicle saying some people who were cutting brush about
9 seven or nine years ago found a box, a wooden box with
10 some interesting old bottles in it and rubber stoppers in
11 bottles, and somebody said, "let's pour some of this out
12 and see what it was."

13 And it was toxic World War I variety poison
14 gas.

15 Did it date from World War I? No, it did
16 not. This is not in the article. I happen to know about
17 this.

18 There was considerable medical testing done
19 here at Letterman Hospital in the 1970s to the '80s,
20 military medical testing. They were trying to develop
21 uniforms.

22 They have them now. The uniforms that you
23 see on our soldiers now are based on research done right
24 here to try to resist penetration of the cloth by known
25 chemicals used in war, and -- and nitrogen mustard is one

1 of the easiest ones to prepare in large quantities and it
2 has been used -- it was -- had some minor usage in World
3 War II.

4 But in the '70s and '80s, the Army in its
5 usual way was disposing of unwanted chemicals by -- I
6 know what they did. I was in the Army.

7 They call a place where there are a couple
8 of GIs sitting around and they would tell "you guys go
9 over here and pick up two barrels of this stuff and just
10 lose it somewhere," and they'd take it and dump it off a
11 cliff or known dump sites, and that's where this stuff
12 came from.

13 Just try it on your computer. It may still
14 there, "Presidio, nitrogen mustard gas" and see if it
15 pops up.

16 There are a lot of things that go on here.
17 I'd like to have some input on this because I have
18 friends who were here serving on the Presidio and know
19 about this sort of thing, but nobody ever asks them.

20 And it's because I was notified so late
21 that I'm, you know, not up to speed on this yet, but I do
22 want to talk to somebody by Monday.

23 MS. MAJHAIL: Thank you.

24 Any other questions? Okay.

25 Let's open the floor -- the floor for

1 public comment period. Anybody wants to make a formal
2 public comment, please say your first and last name and
3 then your comment.

4 MR. BUXTUN: I'm sorry. Are you saying
5 that those of us who have spoken should give our name?

6 MS. MAJHAIL: No. It's just if you need
7 to make a public comment right now. If you're -- if you
8 want to make a public comment regarding the site,
9 regarding the cleanup, then this is a -- this is the time
10 to say your comment.

11 MR. BUXTUN: Before I leave, I would like
12 somebody's card.

13 MS. MAJHAIL: Definitely.

14 Then hearing none, then if there are no
15 comments at this time, then I would like to close this
16 meeting.

17 Thank you all for coming to the meeting and
18 we're here -- if you still want to ask any questions,
19 we'll be here for sometime, and also the sign-in sheet is
20 in the back. People who didn't sign in, please sign in.

21 Please make sure you have your e-mail ID
22 there, because we will be e-mailing you the presentation.
23 And the fact sheets are also there if you need to have a
24 copy.

25 Thank you very much. Thank you all for

1 coming to the meeting, and I'll take the meeting off the
2 record. Thank you.

3 (The meeting concluded at 6:35 PM).

4 ---o0o---

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2013

GOLDEN GATE CLUB

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Mark Youngkin, Facilitator

Eileen Fanelli

4 Brian Ullensvang

Julie Cheever

5 Jan Monaghan

Bill Ingles

6 Sara Segal

John Chester

7 Jim Ketcham

8 Also Present

9 Genevieve Coyle

10 ---o0o---

11

12

13

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on February 12, 2013, 7:04 PM at the
17 Golden Gate Club, Presidio of San Francisco, California,
18 before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of
19 California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the
20 provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements - None	
6	4) Discussions & Presentaitons:	
7	A. Quarterly Report - Eileen Fanelli	4
8	B. Barnard Avenue Protected Range - Not Discussed	
9	C. Mountain Lake North Arm Sediment Sampling	17
10	5) New Business - None	
11	6) Public Comment - None	
12	7) Action Items and Agenda Items:	59
13	8) Closing:	60
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Welcome to
2 the monthly meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board of
3 the Presidio San Francisco.

4 Does everybody have an agenda?

5 MS. SEGAL: Mm-hmm.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I put B on Barnard
7 Avenue Protected Range in case anybody couldn't make the
8 public meeting, unless you want to summarize it.

9 Anything happen at the meeting that's
10 noteworthy? Not really? I'll strike that one.

11 Mountain Lake North Arm. Okay. Any other
12 additions, modifications, additions to the agenda?

13 MS. FANELLI: Do you want to do the
14 Mountain Lake.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Leave it as it is.

16 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Any announcements?

18 Okay. Continuing on to item 4, discussion
19 and presentations, quarterly report.

20 MS. FANELLI: Well, we're all booted up
21 here. So I'm going to set up here a little different.

22 Same agenda for all quarterly reports. So
23 this one is through December 31st. We have made -- that
24 way I can speak this way and I don't have to turn around.

25 A lot happens in the first quarter FY 13. The

1 Draft FS/RAP was issued, as you know, and comment period
2 is closed and the Trust is now responding to those
3 comments with DTSC.

4 We had a windfall of site certifications
5 from DTSC. Landfill E, Baker Beach 3 and 4 after how
6 many years since we sent in that request, LF 4 and 5 and
7 CHP range were all certified. So that was a major, major
8 milestones.

9 Also, probably it wasn't discussed as at
10 some of the RAB meetings, but it's an important document.
11 DTSC issued the final O&M agreement that's the successor
12 agreement to the consent agreement, and it's signed by
13 three parties, DTSC, the Trust and the Park Service. So
14 that's an important agreement.

15 I believe it was e-mailed to you. If it
16 wasn't, we can get you, you know, a copy of it.

17 But basically it's the basis for us to do
18 O&M at sites like landfill E, any site that has
19 continuing maintenance requirements and land use
20 controls.

21 The agreement has with it an O&M plan that
22 was approved. I think it was Medi who was the DTSC
23 person. Genevieve was the primary author on that, and it
24 incorporates the Lucmor.

25 So our Lucmor and/or O&M plan are all a big

1 document now underneath the O&M agreement. So that was a
2 big milestone.

3 Under petroleum, the Regional Board
4 approved us stopping groundwater monitoring at that site,
5 and so we have stopped groundwater monitoring.

6 We have sent in a request for site closure
7 and final well abandonment, and we are waiting for that
8 final closure letter, but we are now moving ahead with
9 Agnes' position on well abandonments, and as of the end
10 of the year, we had abandoned approximately 34 monitoring
11 wells.

12 So you're going to see a lot of well
13 abandonments happening in springtime when the weather
14 gets better.

15 We're going to do four and five wells and
16 I'm not -- I think there may be a couple wells in three.
17 I'm not sure if there's any associated with 3 and 4.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: 3.

19 MS. FANELLI: So 3 will be done, and
20 there's a slough of well abandonments coming up.

21 On FHP, we're ahead of DTSC and there's a
22 big backlog. It was a big quarter.

23 Our budget is 172 million to complete.
24 We've included everything in that. Last month I did
25 talk -- I think one of the RAB had a question or comment

1 are we receiving moneys from Zurich, and the answer's
2 yes. So we do have that agreement with them and we're
3 moving forward.

4 Which projects took the -- spent the most
5 money. Again, never a surprise. Baker Beach 1A, the
6 design and working with the Park Service and for us the
7 FS/RAPs are out.

8 Mountain Lake where we were doing some
9 mapping and we were kicking off the design and we're
10 procuring Dixon Marine, our current contractor.

11 You see some lead-based paint up here for
12 the first time in a long time.

13 We actually had been doing a significant
14 amount of lead-based paint work. I think I mentioned,
15 the Letterman, particularly the houses on Riley and
16 O'Reilly, clad buildings with lots of historic paint on
17 it, very extensive lead around the drip lines.

18 So they're very large cleanups. They're
19 ongoing, and you can -- if you walk I think down
20 O'Reilly, you'll see some of that work in progress for
21 the next several months.

22 We were finishing up the 207/231 sites, so
23 I think that 79,000 there was sort of a last invoice from
24 ERG.

25 We've also installed monitoring wells and

1 we're in the monitoring process there, but essentially
2 our major earth moving is gone. And DTSC oversight.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: So is DTSC oversight about
4 a hundred thousand dollars a quarter? Is that --

5 MS. FANELLI: It's usually more than that.
6 That's actually kind of a low one. I'm kind of
7 surprised. They've been averaging more like 120,000.

8 They were about 80,000 when it was just Bob
9 and then it kind of spiked up and now maybe we're right
10 size a little bit because people are up to speed, and so
11 we have the same set of project folks from DTSC, but
12 they're more familiar with the work, so it's not as much
13 of a learning curve. But usually it's about 120.

14 That's major cost. You can see cumulative
15 to date, three million dollars to DTSC. That's a lot.

16 But, you know, over the last year or two
17 with Denise providing resources, we've moved the program
18 significantly ahead. Significantly ahead.

19 This is just our little snapshot. We're
20 sort of changing this a little bit. I know it was
21 created at a RAB request, but it's -- our financial
22 people are a little -- aren't as comfortable with it
23 because it's -- it's a little too detailed.

24 I can make it really simple like three
25 numbers, but the way it's set up here, they're not really

1 comfortable about the estimated Trust funded because --
2 we have funds in different departments. It's a little
3 confusing, the truth is.

4 The numbers are basically there. It's not
5 that there's an issue that isn't really accurate here.
6 It's just a little confusing.

7 So you might see this table with particular
8 change over the next quarterly report. Especially since
9 now we're receiving money from Zurich, and that kind
10 of -- between the interest and those claims and then what
11 the Trust is doing, it's just not a precise presentation.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: I think the reason why we
13 started this -- asking about this was because we were
14 trying to figure out if we needed to raise money from
15 different sources in order to complete the program or if
16 the Trust was, you know, going to pay out or what was
17 going to happen, you know.

18 MS. FANELLI: Zurich is paying up.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: That's good.

20 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: At the time when we started
22 this whole thing, we didn't know if they were ever going
23 to pay.

24 MS. FANELLI: I understand that's true.

25 Okay. So quickly schedule status. 10 and

1 8 have all been completed. The final CCRs have been
2 submitted, site certification is pending. We still have
3 wells there and we're going to be submitting groundwater
4 analysis shortly.

5 We're actually waiting on that groundwater
6 analysis until we get some comments back from DTSC and
7 Water Board on our groundwater analysis for Nike, and the
8 reason is Nike is upgradient.

9 We want to wait until we do this analysis.
10 But I'm expecting site certification at this point.

11 1 and 2, we had copied -- I had copied you
12 last month on our request for abandoning wells. Many of
13 that will just be one more round of groundwater sampling
14 and looking at the data in a slightly different format,
15 but our expectation, after that, she'll agree that we can
16 stop the monitoring and we'll be abandoning those wells,
17 as well.

18 MS. SEGAL: Can I ask about well
19 abandonment that you talked about in the beginning?

20 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: Does part of the program
22 anticipate well abandonment? At what point do you decide
23 that it's not necessary to inspect a well? How does well
24 abandonment get decided?

25 MS. FANELLI: It gets decided by DTSC or

1 Water Board. So if --

2 MS. SEGAL: Based on results.

3 MS. FANELLI: Post-closure requirements
4 include some amount of groundwater monitoring and we
5 implement that, we get the results, we do an analysis, we
6 send that to DTSC or the Water Board.

7 If they concur, then we ask what the
8 recommendation was, and usually we're doing that to stop
9 monitoring.

10 MS. SEGAL: Is there a time in the closure
11 report say that there are wells in the X number of years,
12 is there a way to say even though we had groundwater
13 monitoring for several years?

14 MS. FANELLI: There is, and it's written
15 into the RAPs. If you see the language on the RAP, it
16 says: "Monitoring for up to three years."

17 Conversely, I can tell you 1349, we did not
18 do all the monitoring, but we did most of it, and for 1
19 and 2, we've done about half -- less than about half of
20 the monitoring.

21 MS. SEGAL: And now she asked us to do
22 more.

23 MS. FANELLI: She asked us to do one more
24 round of monitoring.

25 MS. SEGAL: Is there any more?

1 MS. FANELLI: I wouldn't say more. Those
2 are the ones that we asked for. Sites like Baker Beach
3 3, we stopped monitoring years ago. Sites like -- I want
4 to say 1065, we did all of that monitoring and working
5 with Agnes, they were not being monitored because we have
6 we'd done the three years.

7 MS. SEGAL: Thank you.

8 MS. FANELLI: Mountain Lake, we have some
9 slides on that, and then Genevieve can answer some
10 specific questions. You have the sampling plan that was
11 sent out.

12 Baker Beach 1A and 2, you know where we
13 are. We're responding to the comments now. We do expect
14 to have a Draft RDIP in the next couple of years.

15 It will be submitted to DTSC for Baker
16 Beach 1A, and in about three more weeks, we'll have the
17 one for Baker Beach 2.

18 We did do some drilling a week and a half
19 ago at Baker Beach 2. It was for geotechnical data
20 looking at slope stability issues in particular to help
21 inform how the site is restored or refilled.

22 On RAP6B, really I should take away Battery
23 Howe Wagner. That site has been closed, as you know.
24 We're abandoning one well there.

25 The winter rains came upon us, but it will

1 be abandoned this spring.

2 Fillsite 6B, DTSC asked us to do some
3 additional investigation. We've done that. We're
4 working on the revised report. It is still recommending
5 manage in place with land use control, but we're looking
6 specifically at issues between the commercial developed
7 portion, and that portion which could be in future
8 modified to allow the expansion of the Crissy Marsh or
9 Quartermaster Reach portion of the Tennessee Hollow area.

10 937, we sent in a site certification
11 request and monitoring. We're responding to some
12 comments from DTSC and we're hoping to get that issued
13 shortly.

14 We are going to be doing some post-closure,
15 if you will, subslab monitoring just to confirm stable or
16 declining trends in a little bit of benzene that was
17 detected in subslab after the remedial system.

18 And then on Lobos Creek, we have a summary
19 RI report. Brian's promised us comments this week, and
20 as soon as we get those and address them, the report will
21 go in to DTSC, as well.

22 You'll get a copy of it at that point.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Have they
24 determined where the benzene was coming from?

25 MS. FANELLI: It was a fluke. It wasn't

1 detected before. It's a little odd. They don't know
2 exactly. They thought it came in on some of the
3 materials that were used to put in the subslab venting
4 system.

5 But it is low concentrations. We've done
6 analysis that showed there isn't a risk, a human health
7 risk, but in consultation with Kenny at DTSC, we thought
8 it best to do some monitoring just to confirm that it's
9 stable.

10 It's either stable or defined, and we did
11 something similar to that with one of the wells at 1349
12 with the Water Board.

13 So all of the wells have been non-detect.
14 It always had something, but the problem was documenting
15 that it was stable or declining.

16 So we did that and we sent it to Agnes to
17 close the site.

18 Lead-based paint. We have submitted, I
19 believe, 511 requests for no further action. DTSC has
20 affirmatively acted on 283 of them, so Bob still has a
21 backlog there that he's working on, but we are continuing
22 to move through that program.

23 Basically I believe at this point in time,
24 all of the residential buildings except maybe a handful
25 of garages on one of the streets have been complete.

1 So all of the residential buildings taken
2 care of first has been achieved, and we're working now on
3 some of the commercial industrial type buildings.

4 And that I think is the presentation on the
5 quarterly report.

6 Now we have is some pictures -- I have some
7 photographs, but after that, I have some activities. I
8 think I'll let Genevieve, and we have Bill Ingles is
9 here, our construction manager for the majority of our
10 sites here in Mountain Lake. So he might be able to
11 answer some specific questions.

12 Okay. So next quarter, obviously we're
13 trying to finalize the RDIPs and the construction
14 documents for the final dredging of Mountain Lake.

15 We do have our first phase of work ongoing,
16 but the final dredging we're working on the elements of
17 that and we'll move on.

18 I don't think I did this slide because it
19 shouldn't say "issue Draft RAP." It should say "issue
20 the Final RAP," FS/RAP.

21 We're going to issue the data summary
22 report for Lobos Creek and hopefully we'll have finalized
23 RAW that we just heard the presentation on earlier from
24 BAPR.

25 We are moving ahead with the design

1 drawings for that and we'll be getting a contractor
2 hopefully on board in the next couple of months.

3 On petroleum, we want to complete the Draft
4 Construction Completion Report and we're just in
5 monitoring mode before we ask for site closure, and
6 lead-based paint, we'll just continue to work through
7 that. I think we have more slides on that.

8 So I started that just to show you some of
9 the milestones and I started out graying out where we
10 are.

11 So for Baker Beach 1A, basically we've been
12 in design for a while. We think we're pretty close to
13 being complete. That's why the RDIP is going out this
14 month.

15 We started some veg clearance. If you
16 remember, we did some tree removals, and this month,
17 we'll be beginning to take the vegetation down, further
18 cutting it down so that we can make sure we don't have
19 bird nesting issues when it's time for soil removal,
20 which we hope is as soon as possible weather permitting.

21 If we get a wet spring, obviously this is
22 going to be a little bit later, and also we have to
23 respond from comments on the RDIP from DTSC.

24 B2 looks very similar to Baker Beach 1.
25 Our design here is going to go a little bit longer. It's

1 simpler in many ways than Baker Beach 1A, so hopefully
2 we'll stay on schedule and get that done.

3 We did some tree removals there and we'll
4 be doing veg clearance there in the next couple of weeks.
5 Probably in the last couple weeks of the month we'll do
6 some veg clearance there, and we move the debris as soon
7 as possible, weather permitting.

8 BAPR, I should bring back December. We did
9 one more presentation in December, I think, with you
10 guys. We're now in public comment period, and I should
11 say it started January and ending February.

12 We have a basic design and we're finishing
13 that up, probably not till the end of the month once
14 we're finished with the public comment period, so in
15 March is when we really finalize the design.

16 They're not complicated because it's a more
17 simple removal and getting our contractor on board.

18 That work likely won't happen until later
19 in spring/summer because it is the drainage, and so it is
20 wet because it gets all the runoff. So we'll have to
21 make that dry out.

22 And on Mountain Lake, we've been working in
23 the staging area since December. It's ongoing now. We
24 have some pictures and we're hoping that we actually are
25 sucking up sediment and put it into the bags early next

1 month.

2 Okay. Now, who wants to walk them through
3 the photos?

4 MR. INGLES: I can.

5 If you've walked around Mountain Lake
6 lately, you'll see we really got going in earnest about
7 two weeks ago, and everyday we're more encouraged because
8 they've got a real good schedule going now. They've got
9 more and more people out there doing their thing.

10 So this is a fairly large project for it.
11 It warranted the contractor having a trailer. We haven't
12 done that on past projects.

13 DMS is Dixon Martin Services. So the
14 trailer is located on Park Boulevard Trail and they
15 have -- a superintendent kind of hangs out there when
16 he's not going back and forth and he has a project
17 engineer.

18 One of the first things that we did -- I
19 guess it was last week -- we did temporary fencing up
20 around the beach area at the south end of the lake.

21 I think folks, the powers that be requested
22 that, and the whole idea is basically providing safety
23 probably mostly for the dogs that would tend to want to
24 swim in the water.

25 I don't think people want to swim in there,

1 because once the dredging starts, the action's all
2 underwater and, you know, you don't want to have an
3 injury or something from that suction cutter and getting
4 within -- where a person isn't supposed to be in the
5 water. So we have some protection.

6 MS. FANELLI: I think one of the other
7 goals from the Trust -- just an aside, I know the Natural
8 Resources Department is trying to do some public
9 education by closing the beach area.

10 They make it harder for people to bring
11 mostly stale bread to throw into the lake to feed the
12 ducks. They're trying to get people to stop that kind of
13 behavior.

14 MS. COYLE: There are supposed to be signs
15 coming, but right now, there's signs say: "Beach closed-
16 keep out." But there will be some interpretive signs
17 going up to educate the community, which is good.

18 I don't know if you were there on Saturday,
19 and somebody had pushed the fence down. The fence on its
20 own right now is not working, but hopefully with a little
21 more signage, that will change.

22 MS. SEGAL: Who is it, the Department
23 of --

24 MS. FANELLI: It's out there.

25 MS. SEGAL: Is the Department of Rec doing

1 anything?

2 MS. COYLE: We are working with them. We
3 put up the signage, but we got their approval and their
4 logo as well as ours is on the sign to show it's a joint
5 agency effort.

6 MS. SEGAL: That's good.

7 MR. INGLES: One of the first things they
8 did is they tracked down the east side of the lake. This
9 is where they're going to get access with the large
10 equipment.

11 That is the greatest foe in the world in
12 this kind of limited shot. That area is that -- allowed
13 the crane to initially get set up and the excavator and
14 then track on to the Bob.

15 MS. SEGAL: Is that near 19th Avenue?

16 MR. INGLES: Yes. This is a shot taken
17 from the west side, and again what you see is what we
18 were just looking at, but from a different angle.

19 Those are our barges. Right now, they have
20 essentially three different barges out there, and I'll
21 explain a little bit about what each one does.

22 And the first barge, that's called a spud
23 barge. It's called the spud barge because those tall
24 things sticking up, those metal tubes, they're basically
25 just lowered down and they basically just anchor into the

1 bottom and it holds the barge in position, and they just
2 got a couple long timbers and that excavator just moves
3 back and forth and the first start of the operation, he
4 was basically reaching out and pulling out tulle that
5 were within the limits of what was defined for tulle
6 removal.

7 We're not removing all the tulle in the
8 lake, just certain areas.

9 And basically, then, they use these little
10 boats, and that barge is called a tulle transfer barge.
11 What they do is they lift the tulle into that green
12 container and they just try to move back and forth from
13 shore and those tulle are unloaded and it's just a
14 repetitive process.

15 In fact, they -- theoretically, they've
16 finished tulle removal. So that went pretty good. Went
17 a little bit ahead of schedule.

18 That's just a photo. Again tulle are
19 being loaded into the tulle barge. It just basically
20 pulls up, they push it up the side. It separates our
21 operation, and it worked really well.

22 MS. SEGAL: Is there some alternative to
23 that?

24 MR. INGLES: No. They have to be dried
25 off and then they've going to be hauled offsite.

1 That's just another photo. I slipped down
2 in there and it's just sitting there and excavating --
3 excavating the tulles, and if you look in the background,
4 there's a guy -- a white pole sticking up, surveyors just
5 laying out the approximate limits for the tulle.

6 And once they get to the tulle barges on
7 the left, then another excavator sits there and goes out
8 and puts it into another vehicle and it goes up the hill
9 and runs them over to our staging area and dumps them in
10 the pile.

11 Because those things have to dry out before
12 they can be hauled off. It goes in a particular
13 dumpster.

14 That's just a photo of that little pile.
15 Today it's much larger, and those sit there for a while.

16 And so this is the staging area. That's
17 where all the action is also going on, and they're just
18 breaking up some of the old concrete slabs that were
19 sitting there for many, many years.

20 MS. FANELLI: These are non-historic
21 slabs.

22 MR. INGLES: Non-historic.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Sitting in the staging area
24 or sitting in the lake?

25 MR. INGLES: No. This is the staging

1 area.

2 MR. CHESTER: Do you know what the slabs
3 were previously used for?

4 MS. FANELLI: The non-historic ones for
5 some of the buildings, and we found historic walls. I
6 think I might have mentioned that we found a historic
7 wall.

8 MR. INGLES: That's the wall, and it's on
9 the left side and there's some what appears to be orange
10 netting laying on the ground horizontally.

11 That's an old historic slab. The geologist
12 worked with us and said we should really protect all of
13 that.

14 It's all going to be covered over the fill
15 material. We have to raise the whole site for our work
16 surface about three or four or five feet because of this
17 discovery here.

18 MS. FANELLI: Because of the historic
19 features. So these are being protected. The ones that
20 are being broken up are obviously not protected.

21 MR. INGLES: Okay. So we've had certain
22 days where we close the trail. It's just safer and works
23 better because we have trucks coming and going and
24 actually gets to be -- it would be pretty challenging
25 with dog walkers and everybody else.

1 Today was a hauling day. I think
2 tomorrow -- I can't remember if tomorrow's a trail
3 closure day or not, but what will happen over the next
4 week, two weeks, we're bringing a lot of soil in.

5 So those will be trail closure days, but
6 once the dredging's going on, everything's happening
7 underwater and stuff is brought over to this area,
8 sitting back.

9 So the trail's going to be open because the
10 contractor won't have big trucks going back and forth,
11 and then there will be periods where it's time to haul it
12 out.

13 I think that's going pretty well, and it's
14 really tight in there. So there's not going to be any
15 long time with the trucks.

16 MS. FANELLI: And you see a little bit of
17 dirt on the trail. We'll use a sweeper to --

18 MR. INGLES: We got to make sure because
19 people do walk and a lot of dog walkers, we need to keep
20 all the mud swept up. They're doing a pretty good job of
21 that. So we watch that one pretty closely.

22 MS. COYLE: And they're doing that all the
23 way up to the golfcourse. They're not creating a muddy
24 track.

25 MR. CHESTER: Back on the significant

1 archaeological finds, is the archeologist onsite all the
2 time or is he called out if something -- if an excavator
3 finds something, or is there any anticipation within the
4 lake sediment?

5 MS. COYLE: So in the staging area, there
6 wasn't any -- there wasn't any expectation we were going
7 to find something, so we called them when we covered the
8 foundation.

9 In the lake, there is an archeologist
10 onsite along with shores for removal. She's been there
11 for the last two weeks, and she's there all day and she's
12 working under our archeologist, because there was a
13 potential to discover where there used to be future
14 sediment or use of the short line area and there might be
15 some artifacts there. They didn't find anything.

16 We did a few trenches in that location and
17 they didn't find anything.

18 MS. CHEEVER: What would the slab have
19 been, the one that you are protecting? Could it be an
20 old --

21 MS. COYLE: You know, I haven't gotten
22 anything from cultural about it. All I know is they have
23 the dates of material and they did find that it was
24 nothing.

25 MS. FANELLI: I think we clarified at one

1 earlier meeting, a lot of this tulle removal is not part
2 of remediation. This is work for Natural Resources.

3 And so we are facilitating that in part of
4 our project. It's actually being funded out of a
5 different pot of money, and the archeologist is there is
6 not because of the remediation piece of it, but because
7 of the natural resources piece of it.

8 We did all of our compliance. We did the
9 cores earlier in the lake bottom, and the archeologist
10 looked at that and now we're bringing that sediment off
11 the bottom.

12 MR. INGLES: So we really got going this
13 week in earnest. This is again grading of the staging
14 area. You're kind of standing to the west side kind of
15 looking over the site.

16 In other words, the golfcourse is up to our
17 left and back behind us. So there's lots going on and
18 we'll be over the next several weeks getting this staging
19 area ready, basically bringing it up, making it
20 relatively flat so that they can set up for the receiving
21 and dewatering operation for what's going to be excavated
22 from the lake.

23 Just another view of it. That piece of
24 equipment is a roller and helps compact the earth.

25 MR. CHESTER: Do you bring in materials to

1 build up the station?

2 MR. INGLES: We have to bring it from the
3 dust bowl because we have to get up several feet higher
4 if we ever anticipate because of this archeological area,
5 the wall and slab.

6 MS. FANELLI: It may get removed. It's
7 not clear what the final aspirations for how this area
8 will look are.

9 We're prepared to remove it, though, and
10 the soil -- it's been sitting in the dust bowl for a
11 while.

12 It came from the Transbay Terminal
13 construction for a while in downtown San Francisco and
14 it's been sitting there for a while.

15 MR. INGLES: If we do photos, three months
16 down the road, chances are you'll see some pretty good
17 photos of what the area now looks like with the bags of
18 this stuff and all that good stuff.

19 And again, you won't see much of the
20 dredging. Just the dredge barge and all the action.

21 That's the photo I climbed up to the top of
22 the hill this morning and took that -- you know, they got
23 the site fairly level and now they're bringing it up.

24 It still has to come up another three --
25 three feet in places. So we'll be doing this over the

1 next couple weeks, but we want to be done with this in
2 two, two and a half weeks per the schedule.

3 And the last slide, so this site is
4 obviously a big thing. We don't want to have the wrong
5 stuff run off into the lake, and these are the SWPPP
6 storm inlets along West Pacific, so -- and we did have
7 that little kind of a light rain this last Thursday,
8 Friday, and they put more straw bales in.

9 We have silk fencing in. The site held up
10 pretty good. SWPPP is an ongoing thing. It's always an
11 ongoing thing. Light rainstorms are one thing, but as
12 heavier rainstorms come in, and we're prepared to make
13 adjustments as we need to and add more SWPPP protection,
14 if necessary.

15 But I think we have pretty good SWPPP
16 placement.

17 So that's kind of where the project is
18 right now, and like I say, three months from now, you'll
19 see a lot more work.

20 MS. FANELLI: We have Bill and Genevieve
21 here. You should ask questions about Mountain Lake.
22 They know a lot more than me.

23 MS. SEGAL: Is the total budget over nine
24 million dollars?

25 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

1 MS. SEGAL: It appears to be one of the
2 more high end ventures.

3 MS. FANELLI: It is. It's a big expense
4 item. This is contingency. I'm not prepared to give up
5 any contingency until we actually get in.

6 MS. SEGAL: Part of the money is coming
7 from the state, Caltrans?

8 MS. FANELLI: The funding mechanisms are
9 from all over the place.

10 MS. SEGAL: Nine million --

11 MS. FANELLI: That's just the budget.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Is about 25 percent going
13 to cut it?

14 MS. FANELLI: Yes, it will.

15 MR. CHESTER: You mentioned the SWPPP.
16 What would be the biggest impact of this last storm,
17 like -- it wasn't a storm. A quarter inch of rain.
18 We're in a dry period.

19 Maybe there will be a bigger storm at some
20 point in the future, but what would be your -- what were
21 you -- what is the impact that you're preparing to
22 prevent that -- is it the runoff into the lake?

23 MR. INGLES: Yeah. Actually, our biggest
24 exposure right now would be where we have to go down a
25 fairly steep angle with the east shore access.

1 You know, it's kind of a dirty, muddy mess
2 and they're working on cleaning that up. They had to
3 haul all the wet tulle stuff up to hill.

4 MR. CHESTER: So if you got like a four
5 inch rain in two days?

6 MR. INGLES: We have straw bales along
7 there, we have a silk fence along there. That's probably
8 the area that we might be most prone to have an issue.

9 MR. CHESTER: Is that part of your staging
10 area runoff into the lake?

11 MR. INGLES: Um.

12 MS. COYLE: The whole staging area's all
13 exposed soil there with some slope. So there would be a
14 potential with a storm to feed into the lake.

15 What we're doing is protecting the storm
16 drain so that it protects the lake.

17 MR. INGLES: It's interesting. Probably
18 what will happen in the staging area, the way that
19 they're going to do the bags, they have to basically
20 construct a relatively flat surface with containment, and
21 because we got it in two rounds with filling bags, let
22 the stuff dewater, ripping the bags open, they'll
23 probably -- they got to have a pretty good stable
24 surface. We may have some kind of concrete surface.

25 So if we have a concrete surface, we kind

1 of have to have something pretty good over the dirt so it
2 can't run off. That has to be removed at the end of the
3 project. That's an alternative that we're looking at
4 with them.

5 MS. COYLE: After they're done bringing
6 the level when it's flat and ready to go, the first work
7 item for the dewatering equipment is to put a liner over
8 that whole area.

9 So any rainfall or anything that falls in
10 that liner gets channeled into our water treatment
11 system.

12 So once that liner goes in there, it's
13 going to be much easier to deal with any potential
14 issues. It will be water treatment, and concrete will
15 potentially go on top of that.

16 So it's only now that the soil's really
17 exposed.

18 MR. INGLES: We learned from past
19 contracts that, you know, we've had some pretty big rain
20 event.

21 So what we've done is we've built into the
22 contracts what we call onsite that generally we're able
23 to pay them on time and materials to do what we might
24 have to direct them to do on a quick emergency basis for
25 getting protection in there.

1 We've done a whole combination of things on
2 different projects, the straw bales, we put down netting,
3 built extra trenches.

4 So we got a flexibility on this contract to
5 deal with that.

6 We have some budget for that, which if it's
7 needed, it gets used, and if it isn't needed, then it
8 works out.

9 MS. SEGAL: This isn't a cleanup question,
10 but I think I remember at Mountain Lake, leaving some
11 tulles and I thought there was some -- it's going to
12 change some levels on the edge edges.

13 What's the plan from preventing the tulles
14 approaching again? If I remember, some kind of a -- what
15 is it?

16 MS. COYLE: A shelf. So this will be
17 where Natural Resources works. The remediation footprint
18 goes right up to the edge, but what we're doing is we're
19 taking out sediment from around the eastern corner there
20 for Natural Resources and the purpose of that is to build
21 a four foot fence on the edge and what that will do is
22 prevent tulle encroachment, because tulles don't want to
23 grow the deep in deeper water. So doing that bench will
24 prevent that in the future.

25 And then the follow-up cleanup after we've

1 done that. We're going to do that sediment removal and
2 bench work as part of our dredging.

3 Even though Natural Resources is going to
4 pay for that portion, we're going to do it all throughout
5 the project.

6 Following remediation, Natural Resources
7 will come in and plant submerged aquatic vegetation,
8 which is called SAV along that bench and the hope is that
9 will establish in that area.

10 MS. SEGAL: Because we had talked about
11 doing that.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Can you just leave the
13 sediment down flat and hope it won't shift and adjust or
14 will the bench prevent that from happening or do you have
15 to do the bench?

16 MS. COYLE: We have a grading plan from
17 our engineers that we believe will be stable. We don't
18 expect there to be too much movement because it's not
19 like a tidal water where there's a lot of shifting.

20 But that certainly is a -- is a concern in
21 shifting, but like you said, the plants should help that
22 and the way we cut the slope will keep it stable until
23 that takes effect.

24 MS. FANELLI: It will give us longer time,
25 but it's certainly not going to keep the tulles growing

1 forever. There will have to be feature maintenance.

2 We'll have a better condition for a longer period of time

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So once the
4 dredging actually starts, a rain event really doesn't
5 impact the dredging itself?

6 MR. INGLES: No. I don't think it really
7 does. If it was huge, heavy, heavy rain. We mentioned
8 today that it could possibly affect to some degree what
9 they're doing over in the staging area, or is there
10 filtering equipment?

11 MS. COYLE: Yeah. Our contractor actually
12 said rain is actually good, because what it does is it
13 actually makes some friction in the bags and helps it
14 dewater, actually hit the bag and it helps it in the
15 water.

16 When the rain hits those bags, it falls
17 into our contained area and it's going to go right into
18 our treatment system.

19 So that rainwater will actually go through
20 our water treatment system, will just be collected within
21 our liner.

22 And then our contractor also said in terms
23 of operating the dredge, they can do that when it's
24 raining, unless there's a real severe storm where it's
25 just dangerous for them to be out there.

1 If it's really coming down, they'd stop for
2 the night.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Lightning or
4 something.

5 MS. COYLE: And it's all contained
6 underneath the water, into the pipe, in the bags. In
7 that sense, it's nice.

8 What's good is what -- we're getting the
9 dry weather now when we're doing all the soil work
10 because that's -- right now is where that would be a
11 problem if they had rain.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. How did you
13 arrange that?

14 MS. COYLE: I'm going to knock on wood.
15 We'll still have to keep it going for a few more weeks.
16 Too early to stop right now.

17 MR. INGLES: I think two weeks from
18 tomorrow night starting at 9:00 PM with Caltrans and
19 their contractor helps us, we'll do a lane closure and we
20 run a big crane in and they bring the final barges that
21 are actually the dredging barges in.

22 It probably takes three or four hours. The
23 last one we did two weeks ago, it rained. It worked
24 pretty good. We were there from 9:00 until 2:00 in the
25 morning and lowered all that equipment in, and they set

1 up some work lights.

2 Even though you have a lane closed, nobody
3 slows down. It's unbelievable. They're on a hurry to
4 get through the MacArthur Tunnel and wherever they're
5 going.

6 And then at the end of the project, we'll
7 have to pull all that stuff out of the lake the same way.

8 MS. FANELLI: So did you have specific
9 questions on the north arm sampling or do you want
10 Genevieve just to describe what was --

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you could bring
12 it first a little bit and then I did have questions.

13 MS. COYLE: I apologize. I didn't bring a
14 map or anything to go over, but I didn't see it on the
15 agenda, but one of the comments that Mark had made -- I
16 don't remember if it was one of your own personal
17 comments or it was a RAB comment.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It was my comment.

19 MS. COYLE: But there was a concern
20 that -- so we're talking about the northwest land area.
21 This is what we're calling the north arm of the lake,
22 which is upland wetland area from the lakeshore up to the
23 Mountain Lake Trail.

24 And Mark had said that you had some
25 surveillance out there and walked around there and found

1 it to be very muddy, and we know that there's a wetland
2 out there, and is there a personality that the storm
3 drain that runs north/south through that area could be
4 discharging further up in the lake rather than
5 discharging directly interest the lake.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Actually, I saw a
7 flowing stream at twenty gallons per minute, and we
8 couldn't figure out why there was a flowing stream,
9 whether the pipe was broken.

10 MS. COYLE: What we did is we went back to
11 the records and found as-builts from Caltrans'
12 predecessor agency that showed that the pipe did go from
13 the north arm to the lake -- lake edge and it discharges
14 into the lake.

15 So our response was we believe that the
16 pipe doesn't discharge upstream and it actually does
17 discharge to the lake, that there's not really a concern
18 for contaminants within that wetland area, but we would
19 do field confirmation as part of the RAP.

20 So Caltrans did do a survey of that drain
21 and all the other drains that go into the lake and found
22 that it actually does discharge about halfway up the
23 north arm.

24 So what that means is that the storm drain
25 coming down does not discharge directly into the lake

1 open water. It discharges several hundred feet up north
2 and then it travels across land before it gets to open
3 water.

4 MR. CHESTER: That was your twenty
5 gallons.

6 MS. COYLE: That leads to the potential
7 that that could have contamination similar to what we're
8 finding in the lake.

9 Now that drain -- what's good about that
10 drain compared to the ones that are coming directly off
11 the highway, the ones that are coming off the highway are
12 just taking highway runoff and sending it into the lake.

13 This drain is actually mostly tunnel
14 groundwater. It's actually a combination of tunnel
15 groundwater and highway runoff. So it's not a hundred
16 percent roadway runoff coming through this pipe.

17 Last month, we sent a grant to DTSC to
18 collect sediment samples from the drain outlets to the
19 lake to determine if there's any contamination there.

20 We sent the plan to Lori Coach at DTSC.
21 She approved the plan. We're expecting the results back.

22 We're testing for COCs in the lake, lead,
23 motor oil, zinc. Caltrans is working on a plan -- one of
24 the other elements of the RAP is that Caltrans was going
25 to clean out or somehow retrofit those drains so that we

1 know that there's not any lingering sediment or
2 contamination that could contaminate that area in the
3 future.

4 Caltrans is still working on how they're
5 going to clean out those drains. That will be happening
6 in the next few months.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. So I guess I
8 have some just general questions.

9 Is it an extension of the Mountain Lake
10 RAP? How did it end up in a letter? Is it a pretty
11 brief document?

12 MS. COYLE: Yeah. The reason we wanted it
13 to be brief is we didn't want to -- it's a pretty small
14 sampling. I think there's three -- there's six samples
15 that were taken.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Seven samples.

17 MS. COYLE: And the last sampling that was
18 done was the last sampling. So DTSC was used to that
19 type of plan, and it was, you know, sort of a nice
20 streamlined easy way of getting that and getting it
21 approved and getting work done.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So was it part of
23 the Mountain Lake RAP or project or was this a separate
24 project or whatever you want to call it?

25 MS. FANELLI: It was a commitment as part

1 of the RAP that we would do this investigation of the
2 pipe and then sample.

3 Is there specific concern or is it -- your
4 question, is it --

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: What project is it?

6 MS. FANELLI: It's Mountain Lake at this
7 point.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's just an
9 extension or addendum.

10 MS. FANELLI: We'll see what the results
11 are and we'll act in accordance with DTSC's direction.

12 MR. CHESTER: How deep were the samples?
13 Are they three point composite, four point composite,
14 discrete samples?

15 MS. COYLE: They're discrete samples --
16 I'm sorry I don't have a map showing you. We take them
17 at surface, and then also about one and a half or two
18 feet below surface.

19 There's actually two pipes. We didn't just
20 discover one pipe. One of them discharges further north
21 than the other, and they're one right on top of another.

22 So we looked at the elevation of those
23 pipes to determine where that runoff was, and where the
24 sediment would be settling to choose a depth, and so
25 there's -- in the sampling plan, there's a cross-section

1 showing the elevation of the pipe, the sediment surface
2 and where we're collecting the samples downstream.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I guess my concern
4 is it's notoriously difficult to find contaminated
5 sediment in Mountain Lake. There was two investigations
6 in 1990 that did not find any contamination.

7 The Army's investigation, the Presidio
8 Trust investigation, neither of those found any
9 contamination.

10 So it's really difficult to find
11 contaminated sediment.

12 So even with this workplan, it seems to me
13 it's very reconnaissance level. Of those seven samples,
14 there's only three of them that are in the sediment.
15 There's one really shallow sample.

16 So there's three samples. So it's only 200
17 feet of a line with possible sediment.

18 Do you really expect to find contamination
19 with three sediment samples? You have to be awful lucky.

20 MS. COYLE: I don't know what you mean --

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: In previous
22 investigations, you couldn't find it with dozens and
23 dozens.

24 MS. FANELLI: The previous investigations
25 were composite sampling. This is discrete.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They were discrete,
2 too, but they were all at five feet. So the
3 contamination may be at two or three feet. All of those
4 investigations wouldn't have found contamination at two
5 or three feet.

6 MS. COYLE: I don't have the number of
7 samples, though there are at least six or seven samples.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Three of them were
9 background samples. They were pre-drainage.

10 MS. COYLE: They're all downstream from
11 the discharge.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right, but it's
13 background because it's below the level of the original
14 ground surface. So they're marsh sediments or there was
15 fill from the high construction.

16 In other words, your pipe is up here.
17 Three of the samples are below the level of the pipe.

18 MS. FANELLI: And the reason that they
19 are, I think if you read the workplan, there's been
20 deposition of sediments, not just scour.

21 So what we've tried to do is look at the
22 area where sediments could have been transported and
23 deposited and sample that entire lens of material that
24 appears to be post-construction of that pipe.

25 So that we are sampling a mass of sediment

1 that could have accumulated over time in that area.

2 So we are targeting specifically the tough
3 stuff that would have been deposited because of operation
4 of that pipe.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: These three
6 sediments are below that level. They're called pre-
7 drainage sediments, right? Pre-drainage. They're at
8 four feet below the level of the existing ground surface
9 when the pipe was installed.

10 Unless it was all scoured out and then
11 replaced, your sediment doesn't show that. The sediment
12 shows the original ground surface and three samples below
13 that.

14 MS. COYLE: I'm not --

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's called pre-
16 drainage samples. What does that mean in the workplan?

17 MS. COYLE: I don't remember that term,
18 but I do know that what we tried -- what Eileen was
19 saying, what we're trying to do is target that sediment.

20 So what we did is collecting one at the
21 surface, where there's more material. That interface
22 between the original surface and where we believe that
23 sediment had accumulated, because that would give us
24 everything from when the pipe first started discharging
25 to the newer material on top.

1 So we're looking at all that newer
2 material. So I wouldn't characterize those previous ones
3 as background.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Pre-drainage is
5 background.

6 MS. FANELLI: I don't know if we can
7 answer your questions tonight. We don't have a copy of
8 the plan here.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Mountain Lake,
10 contaminated sediment is 1938 to 1980, and that's between
11 thirty centimeters and twelve centimeters. So if you
12 went four feet in Mountain Lake, you would never find any
13 contamination.

14 Likewise, samples 0.5 feet, you're not
15 going to find any contamination at all. So if you take
16 out the samples at 0.5 and four feet, that leaves three
17 samples of two feet in your plan. They might find
18 contamination. That's in the right area.

19 But if you have sediments and stream
20 deposition, the time changes laterally. It's not like a
21 lake where you have a nice lateral time horizon, you
22 know.

23 In the streams, the stream moves, sediments
24 deposit one each here and one each there. It's really
25 hard to predict where the age of sediment could be.

1 So if you're looking from 1938 to 1980, I'm
2 sure you can say it might be here, but you really don't
3 know because it's not that line that's existing.

4 How do you find sediment from 1938 to 1980
5 in Mountain Lake?

6 MS. FANELLI: Well, that's what we
7 attempted to do actually in our document. So your
8 comment is you're not convinced that our methodology is
9 right.

10 I can't answer the question without the
11 document here. So we need to go back and look at it, but
12 we're trying to target the buildup of sediments that
13 would have been deposited right after that pipe was
14 constructed till today.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Exactly. And
16 that's the right approach. But the only way the
17 contamination is found at through Mountain Lake is at
18 sampling at six inch intervals in the cores.

19 The traditional EPA approved sampling
20 method didn't work twice in two investigations. Reidy
21 came along in its graduate thesis, the XRF web sampling
22 of his cores every six inches and he found a beautiful,
23 you know, pattern that indicated exactly where 1938 to
24 1980 was, going from like 200 parts per million lead up
25 to 5,000 in the back.

1 Even though he was criticized, that's not
2 EPA approved, but he found the contamination.

3 So if you're not doing this XRF screening
4 of the cores, you can't tell me where the 1938 to 1980 --

5 MS. FANELLI: I don't think we care where
6 the actual lip is of 1938 to 1980. What we want to know
7 if that massive core of sediment has.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But you'll never
9 find it.

10 MS. FANELLI: We disagree. Your comments
11 are well taken. We have to go back and look at it. And
12 then we can comment.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I may send in a
14 comment.

15 MS. FANELLI: If you'd like to send in a
16 comment.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The other thing
18 that I can say, there's thousands of feet of highway that
19 drains into the north arm. There was 400 feet of
20 highway.

21 There's the chance of being sediment in the
22 north arm. There's a lot more highway draining in there.
23 There's probably a stream there to start with. This
24 might even be part of the original stream.

25 I'm not sure, but in a storm event, there's

1 over a thousand feet of highway that's dumping
2 contaminated runoff into the north arm regardless of what
3 the groundwater flow is. The same amount of stormwater
4 either way, right.

5 You just have the space flow of groundwater
6 all the time.

7 So twenty gallons per minute we saw in
8 November was dry weather groundwater flow, not in the
9 wintertime.

10 So where did all of that sediment go to?
11 It's the sediment that we're talking about, and there's
12 no reason I can see why there shouldn't be contaminated
13 sediment there.

14 If there's all this contaminated sediment
15 in Mountain Lake, there's more than twice as much roadway
16 draining into the north arm. There has to be
17 contaminated sediment somewhere there.

18 Maybe they still do it and it doesn't make
19 a nice layer responsible, but unless you really try to
20 find it, you're not going to find any contamination. I
21 can tell you that now just based on this plan.

22 So, you know, that's -- that's my concern.
23 My confidence that this could find contamination in the
24 first place is low, and I know it's great to not find
25 any. Especially in a place like the north arm of

1 Mountain Lake where, you know, it's a challenging
2 project, I'm sure.

3 So I'll write this up and send it in and
4 we'll see what happens.

5 Thank you.

6 Any other questions on the north arm
7 sampling program?

8 MR. CHESTER: I didn't see the sample. I
9 don't know if it was e-mailed to us, but did it go to
10 DTSC?

11 MS. FANELLI: Oh, yeah. DTSC's reviewed
12 it and approved it. And we've done the sampling. We
13 just don't have the data back yet.

14 But if anybody doesn't have their copy and
15 wants a copy, e-mail me or Genevieve and we'll zip you a
16 copy of it.

17 MR. CHESTER: The DTSC comment, did they
18 comment on it?

19 MS. FANELLI: I don't know. They approved
20 it.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I don't think they
22 could comment, anyway. These are specialized things that
23 we're talking about here.

24 They're just finding a flowing stream out
25 there. It was obvious there's something coming there.

1 Why is it that we were the first ones to go out there and
2 find it? It's really mysterious.

3 A lot of consultants and people have worked
4 on that part of the project. Nobody went out there and
5 saw the flowing stream going through the middle of the
6 road on the alignment of the pipe? It's just very
7 mysterious to me, mystifying.

8 So that's a specialized thing. I wouldn't
9 think Lori Coach could comment on it. She's not that
10 involved with it.

11 Anyway, any other comments?

12 MR. KETCHAM: What's your worst fear?

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That they won't
14 find anything there and there will be something there and
15 then the next graduate student that comes along will find
16 it, you know.

17 If you don't use the technique this
18 graduate student used to find the contamination, how can
19 we be confident that you even really found it?

20 Because two previous surveys --
21 investigations using similar techniques the way you're
22 using now didn't find it.

23 MS. FANELLI: But our subsequent points
24 that we're sampling in the lake did. Once we understood
25 it was there, we did point sampling, discrete samples,

1 following it using XRF, and we did find it.

2 I can accept your comment that maybe our
3 sampling isn't dense enough. We'll take a look at that
4 and try to respond to that comment, but I would argue
5 that XRF is not the answer.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The main comment is
7 you have to target that time period when the contaminated
8 sediment was being deposited.

9 The only way to do that is with XRF field
10 sampling, and if you don't do that -- you don't really
11 know where the 1938 sediment is located because you got
12 more recent sediments that are clean. You got fill
13 material from highway construction.

14 MS. FANELLI: As you described, the
15 depositional history in this area is much different than
16 at the bottom of the lake, and you may not see the same
17 signature as what he saw.

18 We have two series of pipes, one that was
19 obviously installed by Caltrans, and for whatever reason,
20 another pipe showed up. Who knows why? And we don't
21 even know the time frame of that pipe.

22 We're trying to target based on the flow
23 lines of where that water would have left the pipe hit
24 the lake in a waive of sediment. A delta has formed.
25 We're trying to sample that delta.

1 Because that would be a material thing that
2 would most likely contain any residuals from.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It would be a delta
4 at the shoreline, but there's 200 feet of stream,
5 streaming deposition, delta and stream.

6 MS. FANELLI: Right.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's a complicated
8 scenario.

9 MS. FANELLI: Well, there could be some
10 exposure, which would be in the bottom of the lake at
11 this point, and there could be some deposition, and so
12 we're trying to get that entire wedge within that area.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And there's a lot
14 of sediment. Not all of it contaminated. But in the
15 lake, most of the sediment is not contaminated.

16 MS. FANELLI: The upper two, two and a
17 half feet obviously is --

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But there's still a
19 lot of sediment that cannot be contaminated. So to
20 separate those out in a stream environment is a little
21 trickier than in the lake.

22 MS. FANELLI: How many feet are we talking
23 about from the pipe from the lake? A hundred, two
24 hundred?

25 MS. COYLE: I think it's a couple hundred,

1 but I'd have to look at that. I don't remember.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So if you do a core
3 vol and if you did XRF every six inches and it comes up
4 clean, you can be pretty confident that there's not a
5 surprise there, right?

6 If you don't do the XRF and you do two
7 samples, you don't really know if that's the appropriate
8 age or not.

9 Did you miss that horizon? Is that core
10 hole in the wrong place? You're not mapping the sediment
11 on the surface so you don't really know the extent of the
12 sediment or where it actually is.

13 MS. FANELLI: We're trying to characterize
14 the bulk, the mass because obviously we don't necessarily
15 based on discretes.

16 We've never done that anywhere. Right? We
17 cleanup based on an exposure for mass.

18 So we're hoping that obviously the samples
19 that we've taken will tell us if there's a problem and
20 direct us to the interval that we need to remove and
21 clean up.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: Did you take discrete
23 samples or not? You just said the volume --

24 MS. FANELLI: We're taking discretes. But
25 we don't always go after discretes everywhere and clean

1 it up.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: To do a vol
3 characterization, there's a lot of samples. If what I'm
4 saying is right, you want three valid samples. That
5 cannot be statistically done in the volume area.

6 There's a dilemma there. That's all.

7 MS. FANELLI: I understand.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'll write it in.

9 MS. FANELLI: I think we understand your
10 comment. Please, send it in. We'll think about it as we
11 look at the data so we can respond to that specific
12 comment.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I know XRF and
14 chlorine is not in itself a very expensive proposition,
15 you know. XRF, you probably have it already. I'm not
16 sure. The laboratory analysis is what is the cost and
17 mobilization.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Just one more thing, though,
19 to follow up what Jim asked. Your fear is not that a
20 grad student will find it, but if it's in there, it's bad
21 for the lake.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That would be
23 another explanation that no, it's not that critical, so
24 it's not a threat to the marsh or something like that.

25 I guess I'm more concerned just about this

1 technique. You can't really be certain you found the
2 contamination in the first place. So if you can't find
3 it and sample it, and if you can't target it and find it,
4 your samples don't really mean a lot unless you're going
5 to do a statistical -- try to prove the whole mass of
6 sediment of 200 feet just by random sampling. But you
7 need a lot more samples than what you got right now.

8 You were trying to target it but doing your
9 in, site model. This is the original ground surface,
10 you're going to find this wedge. If you were trying to
11 target and do that. It's not an easy task and not as
12 easy as it seems.

13 I'll write this up and maybe you can see if
14 you understand.

15 MR. KETCHAM: It sounds like what you're
16 saying is we're doing this project and we're spending all
17 this money.

18 I would like to feel at the end that we are
19 really confident that we've done this well, and you're
20 not feeling that right now.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm not feeling
22 that. If you just added this relatively inexpensive
23 field screening technique, it would have answered.

24 If you have seven core holes and they're
25 all straight line XRF lead concentrations, that says a

1 lot more than just having three samples that are lower
2 concentrations.

3 It's just the confidence that you've
4 actually targeted the right area or layer or whatever and
5 took a representative sample of it. So -- you guys can
6 have fun reading it when it comes out.

7 MS. SEGAL: Can I ask you to clarify? You
8 said the Caltrans -- the contamination from the highway
9 that's contaminated the sediments of Mountain Lake is 400
10 feet?

11 What's another thousand feet north of the
12 north arm? What's going to be changed there?

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you look at a
14 map of the highway there, Mountain Lake -- there's two
15 drains that came into the lake.

16 MS. SEGAL: That Caltrans did.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Plus the pipe is
18 coming into the lake. So --

19 MS. SEGAL: Here's the lake.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Sampling of LXE 25
21 came out clean. So your consensual model is that
22 contamination didn't come out from there into the lake,
23 so no sampling was done in the LXE 25.

24 MS. SEGAL: A thousand feet to the north
25 and this is the 400 you're concerned about.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The first drain
2 that goes into the north arm is the one they tried to
3 explain the manhole at and they couldn't find the
4 manhole, so I guess the manhole doesn't exist, either.

5 That storm drain dumps in the north arm
6 there near the short line of the lake.

7 From that all the way to the tunnel is a
8 thousand feet plus what's inside the tunnel is more than
9 a thousand feet --

10 MS. SEGAL: Right.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: -- of runoff coming
12 off the highway going into the pipe of the north arm.

13 I'm just trying, because this much
14 contaminated sediment coming from 400 feet, why wouldn't
15 you have contaminated sediment from over a thousand feet
16 into the north arm?

17 So my idea was, you know, it might be
18 there. We found it over here in Mountain Lake. It was
19 hazardous -- not that Mountain Lake required all this
20 work. Why not really try to find it in the north arm? I
21 know you are, but that's just a different opinion.

22 But I'll write out what I'm saying and you
23 can consider it and give it to your people and see what
24 you do.

25 Any other questions?

1 MS. MONAGHAN: I had -- I looked at my
2 e-mail and we did not receive the operations and
3 maintenance agreement. So it would be nice to get that.

4 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: I'd like to read it.

6 And then I was looking at the schedule
7 trying to figure out what's coming up next and you're
8 working on something for Lobos Creek.

9 MS. FANELLI: Summary RI report.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: Do we want to target a
11 presentation in April or something?

12 MS. FANELLI: That would be fine. We're
13 hoping that it goes actually to DTSC in the next week and
14 a half.

15 Brian's giving us some comments this week
16 and we're hoping to turn those around and get the
17 document to DTSC hopefully before the end of the month,
18 obviously.

19 So yes, we can do a presentation in April.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Anything else?

21 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. I was looking at
22 these schedules and you're sending the document in March,
23 so I'm thinking we might talk about it in April.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Which one was that?

25 MS. MONAGHAN: This is Lobos Creek.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Oh, Lobos Creek.

2 MR. KETCHAM: What's the latest on Pop
3 Hicks project?

4 MS. FANELLI: My understanding is that the
5 planning department, so it's Cynthia Skovlin, as well, is
6 working on an RFP.

7 MR. KETCHAM: Is the remediation project
8 still going?

9 MS. FANELLI: No. It's done and the site
10 is certified.

11 MR. KETCHAM: So it's all good and ready
12 to go.

13 MS. FANELLI: She's been working on an RFP
14 and we've asked to review it, because there are
15 requirements when you're building on top of a landfill.
16 They're not all that bad. You just need to be aware of
17 it.

18 So we're waiting to see a copy of the RFP
19 so that remediation can add to it just to make sure all
20 that information's there.

21 But the site's certified.

22 MR. KETCHAM: Okay.

23 MS. FANELLI: So we've also submitted a
24 natural gas annual report, and based on that, we haven't
25 had any gas -- fence. So we've asked to close up the

1 majority of them and just monitor the high ones, and
2 we've gotten approval for that and the monitoring's
3 ongoing.

4 MR. KETCHAM: Good. So the remediation
5 project was completed successfully?

6 MS. FANELLI: Yes. We did some planting,
7 a little bit of planting, and I think the rest of the
8 landscaping will be part of it.

9 MR. KETCHAM: Okay.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
11 comments, questions?

12 How about some agenda items for next month?
13 Any ideas? Anything to put down for next month?

14 MS. FANELLI: We'll have the information
15 for Baker Beach 1A, the design drawings. So we can
16 certainly share a couple of the sheets and show you what
17 the grading plan looks like there.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. I guess
19 Mountain Lake. Mountain Lake updates?

20 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Anything else?
22 Anything to talk about next month?

23 MR. CHESTER: Well, follow-up on what you
24 were discussing with the sediment.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

1 MS. FANELLI: We might have some sample
2 results.

3 MR. CHESTER: And on that, we've talked
4 about a lot, is there concern, too, that the sediment
5 that may or may not -- may or may not be contaminated up
6 there could mobilize in the future, move further
7 downstream into the lake where the remediation effort
8 has --

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That is what the
10 sampling is supposed to answer. Has the sediment
11 transferred from the north arm of the lake to the delta?

12 MS. FANELLI: When we get the data, we'll
13 be happy to share and we understand Mark's concern --

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

15 MS. FANELLI: -- that we need to be
16 representative and make sure we got it.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I guess that's
18 enough.

19 Any final comments?

20 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

21 (The meeting concluded at 8:21 PM).

22 ---o0o---

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2013

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Mark Youngkin, Facilitator

Eileen Fanelli

4 Brian Ullensvang

Julie Cheever

5 Jan Monaghan

Sam Berman

6 Toni Kramer

Sara Segal

7 John Budroe

Gloria Gee

8 John Chester

Edward Callanan

9

10 ---o0o---

11

12

13

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

16 of the Meeting, and on March 12, 2013, 7:06 PM at the

17 Presidio Trust, Building 67, Presidio of San Francisco,

18 California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527,

19 State of California, there commenced a RAB meeting under

20 the provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	4
6	4) Reports and Discussions - Eileen Fanelli	
7	A. Mountain Lake Update	21
8	B. Baker Beach 1A RDIP/Design	43
9	C. Mountain Lake North Arm Sampling Results	22
10	5) New Business	55
11	6) Public Comment - None	
12	7) Action Items and Agenda Items	62
13	8) Adjournment:	64
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the
2 regular monthly meeting of the Presidio Restoration
3 Advisory Board, Tuesday March 12th, 7:00 PM. We're in
4 Building 67.

5 Has everybody had a chance to look at the
6 agenda? Any additions or -- I would like to add Lindrom
7 Court to the new business, and in old business, I would
8 like to spend a few minutes talking about our final
9 report case history.

10 Without Julie and Jan here, it's a little
11 tough, but -- okay. Agenda approved.

12 Moving on, announcements. Any
13 announcements? Owls in the Presidio.

14 MS. SEGAL: No. There aren't any that I
15 know.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Old business.
17 Anything carried over from the last meeting?

18 MS. SEGAL: The pictures of Mountain Lake
19 that you took.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I sent out pictures
21 of Mountain Lake. Walked around. My cc list is about
22 twenty people, all agency members.

23 MS. FANELLI: I didn't get them unless
24 they are too big and they bounced.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No. I'll send them

1 out. I'll send it out to everybody.

2 The pad is pretty impressive up there.

3 Impressive, and that pipe, big piece of PVC, black PVP?

4 MS. FANELLI: I actually have not been out
5 there. You've been out there more recently than I have.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Interesting. Okay.
7 Moving on to old business. We've just been talking about
8 this RAB final report or something, some documentation we
9 can do, so I just had a few thoughts about that lately.

10 Maybe we can organize it around case
11 histories of some sort, if we could just pick out what
12 we've contributed, you know, the topics and then put
13 together a case history sort of explaining why we did it
14 and what we did.

15 MS. SEGAL: What's the deadline according
16 to the legislation of the Trust? Does the RAB stop being
17 in existence the 2014 date? I don't know.

18 MS. FANELLI: The --

19 MS. SEGAL: I don't know what the language
20 is.

21 MS. FANELLI: The RAB is not part of May
22 2014. It's separate from that. That's just our
23 insurance policy. It's tied to the consent agreement.

24 The Trust goal, of course, is to have the
25 consent agreement rescinded or surpassed as soon as we

1 can around -- around that timeframe.

2 We'll see if we get there. We do have the
3 O&M agreement which I e-mailed to everyone. That's the
4 successor agreement, essentially.

5 So right now they both exist, but when the
6 consent agreement goes away, the O&M agreement would be
7 in its place.

8 MS. SEGAL: It would be interesting -- I
9 should go back to the old RAB books and see. It comes
10 from the Superfund legislation is what required the RAB,
11 so --

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: President Clinton
13 signed an executive order, I believe.

14 MS. SEGAL: So you're saying we're going
15 to issue a final report?

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: One case history
17 can be the history. We're talking about the final
18 report. I was thinking that case histories might be a
19 good way to organize it.

20 If we can come up with what we've
21 contributed, the topics and then write a case history on
22 those points, what did we do that's important and just
23 tell that story, I guess.

24 So for me, it would be sort of like finding
25 out that there was research that hadn't been done and

1 then doing that research, you know, that case history of
2 my database, as an example.

3 Why did that happen --

4 MS. CHEEVER: Work on that Nike missile
5 site.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That could be one.

7 MS. CHEEVER: But your database --

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It just kind of
9 illustrates the point, why did this information not get
10 into the system and why did it take me to find it and put
11 it into the system? Just that story.

12 How did that process or didn't work and why
13 was it important for us to be there to do that?

14 MS. SEGAL: What are the projected time
15 frames for getting -- what would the purpose of this
16 particular RAB issuing -- our RAB final report? Is it to
17 the Trust? Is it to the --

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's to the
19 community.

20 MS. SEGAL: The community. Okay.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: You were going to include
22 it in your reporting, aren't you?

23 MS. FANELLI: Right. I see there's an
24 opportunity when we write the report that closes out the
25 consent agreement, the RAB activity is an element of the

1 consent agreement.

2 And so certainly I could say something, but
3 if your report is done, then it could be appended and so
4 it lives even grander, you know, because it's part of
5 this --

6 MS. SEGAL: Okay.

7 MS. FANELLI: -- document that sits there
8 on DTSC's Envirostor for as long as they keep it.

9 MS. SEGAL: And so would the goal date be
10 May of 2014?

11 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I think that's sort
12 of a reasonable -- it's the late spring of 2014. We
13 would be hoping to have our sort of summary report pulled
14 together by then, or at least in really good shape so
15 that even if there were activities we were still doing,
16 it's essentially done so it's an easy final editorial
17 task to dot the I's, cross the T's on those outlying
18 activities and get the thing.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Don't we have time to talk
20 about what some other examples would be?

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I thought we could
22 start the process by trying to come up with what are the
23 important aspects we've contributed.

24 Can we actually tick those out? One might
25 be financial project reporting, class reporting. That

1 whole area was fairly poorly developed and we've worked
2 on that a lot, and I think it's turned out to be very
3 handy for everybody.

4 MS. GEE: And getting the hiring of
5 that -- of that position or what do you call?

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The data entry
7 person. That's a good story there. It wouldn't have to
8 be overly long.

9 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It just makes a
11 point that we were here, we did this. Maybe you could
12 apply this to other places and other situations.

13 MS. CHEEVER: I could think of some others
14 and we're brainstorming a bit, but one is the objections
15 to the Army's FS and then how that --

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's a good case
17 history.

18 MS. CHEEVER: And in a way, one thing that
19 happened there was I think the RAB really operated to
20 bringing in the conduit of information to the community
21 or encouraging the community groups to participate.
22 Maybe that's an amorphous subject.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The public outreach
24 of that was a big deal. The public outreach.

25 MS. SEGAL: We had the whole idea of a

1 community RAB.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Doug Kern was a big
3 part of that outreach and participation.

4 MS. CHEEVER: We all remember the fact
5 sheets.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yes, we did.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: So far to participate in
8 the Cal.

9 MS. FANELLI: The project.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Have a transition of how
11 you were outreaching.

12 MS. SEGAL: Right.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

14 MS. CHEEVER: I remember sort of a logjam
15 or a jam. Brian, you took a lot of initiative in helping
16 to write the very first plans for that site of Crissy
17 field.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: The 637 cap.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: We wrote part of that in
20 presenting and get behind there. That was the first
21 decision document after the Trust took over the cleanup,
22 I think.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Was it the DES or not?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: DEH was under the Army.

25 MS. CHEEVER: But what was that site

1 called?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: DEH was now the east
3 beach. The one that you guys participated in more so, I
4 think, is the 637.

5 MS. CHEEVER: These are two different --

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: Those are two different
7 ones. I'm not sure how --

8 MS. CHEEVER: I'm thinking you helped get
9 things rolling.

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: We worked with the Army a
11 lot on DEH. There was a lot of discussion. There was a
12 lot of conflict.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right. And I was trying
14 to encourage everyone to come together so that we could
15 get a decision document.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It was a
17 collaborative thing on the 637 cap. Yeah. There's some
18 interesting case histories that could be written up. Not
19 an opus, but little shorter things and we can actually
20 kind of finish.

21 MS. CHEEVER: We were talking about a RAB
22 final report.

23 MS. KRAMER: Okay.

24 MS. CHEEVER: You know what else? My own
25 sort of realistic point of view, I would like to see some

1 kind of timeline. It wouldn't have to be too long,
2 but --

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It could be just
4 the history of the RAB. One of the case histories could
5 be the history.

6 MS. CHEEVER: To indicate where the --

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: To tie it all
8 together, and then these other case histories can fit
9 inside of a frame.

10 MS. SEGAL: Before -- the old RAB got
11 involved before my time with the early Tennessee Hollow
12 thing, too.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's what I
14 worked on when I got involved. Walking through the
15 poison oak. Those were interesting times.

16 Anyway, if we could come up with an
17 outline. I think an outline might be good in this case.

18 MS. SEGAL: Get those -- there's so much.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The history of the
20 RAB and the outline these case histories that would
21 follow that first section.

22 The first section would be like the history
23 and story, and then inside the story are the case history
24 that follows for each point.

25 The RAB contributed on the cost and project

1 accounting and that would go out to a case history.

2 So some kind of outline that would work
3 like that. I pulled out all my own notebooks. I have
4 like three of them.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: I have a whole box of
6 stuff. I sent you some ideas a couple months ago. I'll
7 resend it.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. I'll compile
9 them together into an outline.

10 MS. SEGAL: Maybe a subcommittee or
11 something wants to work on that or something like that,
12 too. Everybody.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We can just see if
14 that starts to work, you know. Can the history of the
15 RAB serve as an outline to write these case histories on.

16 It sounds possible, huh? You talk about
17 the history of the RAB, and we contributed to the cost
18 and accounting by and then refer to the case history on
19 that or something like that.

20 MS. CHEEVER: When we were talking about
21 how long the RAB would last or at least how long it would
22 be supported, maybe we'll have a life after.

23 I didn't -- you mentioned the O&M agreement
24 will replace the consent agreement, but what is the date
25 that that would have to be, when the O&M would be

1 released and when the RAB would --

2 MS. FANELLI: The O&M agreement does not
3 refer to public review or RAB review any longer. It's
4 after the remediation. So I think it's outside the
5 legislative requirements that a RAB exists.

6 MS. CHEEVER: What requirements -- when
7 would whatever requirement there is expire?

8 MS. FANELLI: I think it -- I think that
9 the RAB is referenced in the consent agreement. I think
10 as soon as the consent agreement is rescinded or
11 completed, that would be the formal acknowledgement by
12 DTSC that all the requirements or conditions of that
13 consent agreement had been reached and now it's no longer
14 needed.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's also
16 mentioned in the Army MOA.

17 MS. FANELLI: I don't -- that I'd have to
18 go back and read.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that that --
20 there's something that the Trust will continue the RAB.
21 I don't know if it talks about duration in there or if
22 it's just more of a --

23 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: -- concept.

25 MS. CHEEVER: What would be the

1 termination date, if any?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not sure if it's any
3 different than any other RAB. When the cleanup's done,
4 it's done.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's done.

6 MS. CHEEVER: So what's the current date
7 of that? The end of 2013?

8 MS. FANELLI: It would be when -- the way
9 I would document it is the cleanup is done is when the
10 consent agreement is rescinded.

11 Our goal is to rescind that as soon as we
12 can around that May 2014 timeframe. I don't think it
13 will coincide exactly.

14 There will probably be some type of a tail
15 to some of our activities, but the major remediation
16 activities -- we do hope we're all going to be
17 essentially completed this summer.

18 That construction will be done and there is
19 no more construction per that -- per the consent
20 agreement.

21 Now, we'll see if that's really the case or
22 not.

23 MS. CHEEVER: That does clarify what the
24 goal would be, late spring 2014.

25 MS. FANELLI: I think it should be.

1 That's a good target, and of course as we go through into
2 next fall and we understand the final activities and how
3 successful we are in getting our construction done, we'll
4 have a better idea of how much longer our activities
5 under the consent agreement will continue.

6 MS. GEE: One of the things that would be
7 useful in that document is like if we could list those
8 sites that have all the monitoring things.

9 Like we said, there's some periodic
10 monitoring and they could summarize which sites those
11 will be. I think that would be really good.

12 MS. FANELLI: In?

13 MS. GEE: In the final report. Aren't
14 there supposed to be periodic monitoring?

15 MS. FANELLI: That's correct, and the O&M
16 agreement covers that post remediation, and there is an
17 O&M plan that's posted on the web page that's approved,
18 and it has all of the individual site O&M plans on there
19 and it does have a summary table, and we add do it as we
20 need to, if there are sites that require an additional
21 O&M.

22 MR. CALLANAN: The money that's
23 appropriated for that work.

24 MS. FANELLI: We're actually using
25 Zurich's money at this point. We are. We used the Army

1 money and we're using Zurich's money to finish the work.

2 MR. BERMAN: Is there any specific
3 language that defines the RAB in terms of the original
4 legislation that created the RAB in terms of the -- of
5 its obligations that indicates some kind of termination?

6 MS. FANELLI: I don't know.

7 MS. SEGAL: I think the Superfund law plus
8 any executive orders.

9 MR. BERMAN: The specific legislation that
10 created that -- that creates the RAB having to do with
11 the -- the cleanup of all the bases.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that's the BRAC
13 legislation.

14 MR. BERMAN: The BRAC. And so it would
15 seem to me that there would be some language in there
16 that specified longevity and whether it should continue
17 in some form beyond the consent agreement and not -- I
18 mean, because that's really -- the BRAC legislation is
19 really the defining legislation that defines who the RAB
20 is.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that regardless
22 what the consent agreement says, if the RAB's purpose is
23 to opine on the cleanup and if the cleanup's done, then
24 it's -- the purposes get pretty narrow.

25 MR. BERMAN: Right, but there is this

1 whole question of -- of the continuing monitoring.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

3 MR. BERMAN: And so it's not as if there
4 is a -- it's all over and everything is done. If it was
5 all clean closure, it would be all over, but there's
6 actually some monitoring that goes on, and it's not clear
7 what defines the RAB's duty in that case, but maybe
8 there's some -- some wisdom or clarity that's given in
9 the BRAC legislation.

10 MS. FANELLI: We can certainly look into
11 it. I don't know.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I seem to recollect
13 that we were on new territory here, that the Presidio RAB
14 was unique and did not really fit into that --

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: It would always be a good
16 spot to see if the legislation did address that at all
17 and make sure we've got whatever authority made the Trust
18 continue this, which is either going to be the consent
19 agreement or MOA or some combination.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I think it was the
21 feeling among all the stakeholders that we were actually
22 contributing something that led more to us continuing
23 rather than guidelines or the wording in the regulations.

24 I think we've just extended our lifespan by
25 credibility more than anything else.

1 MR. BERMAN: Right, yeah, but -- that's a
2 reasonable approach, but I was looking for the
3 legalistic --

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I don't think
5 you're going to find it, but I think we should look.
6 There wasn't anything to find.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: I have some of the original
8 documents that I got when I joined the RAB. I'll bring
9 them in and look through them and pick that out.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Someone like the
11 Army would not want to pay for the RAB after they didn't
12 have to. So the consent agreement would probably --
13 they'd get out as fast as they could.

14 MR. BERMAN: Right, but in the MOA with
15 the Army, the Army was out, anyway, so they maybe had a
16 charitable look at that issue.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's worth checking
18 in to. My recollection is they didn't really talk about
19 us very much.

20 MR. BERMAN: But there may be a sentence
21 or two.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's all it would take
23 that sentence or two.

24 MS. SEGAL: Would the RAB be able to
25 continue even if there is a line item? For example, Mark

1 costs money.

2 MS. FANELLI: There is.

3 MS. SEGAL: If the cleanup is finished and
4 the RAB is finished, does that mean then the line item
5 goes away?

6 MS. FANELLI: There would probably be
7 significant scrutiny of continuing costs --

8 MS. SEGAL: Right.

9 MS. FANELLI: -- that there wasn't a
10 defined purpose or legal requirement for.

11 MS. SEGAL: Which the final report that
12 you envision might, in fact, be a good supporting
13 document for making the case for whatever we do.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Plus keeping the
15 momentum going is harder and harder. Doug was a big part
16 of the momentum here.

17 MR. BERMAN: You know who would know about
18 such things pretty much is Saul Bloom, because he was
19 involved in the original BRAC legislation and the
20 language that was in there, and if you know how to
21 contact him.

22 MS. SEGAL: Yeah. Our counsel.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Somebody tried to
24 contact him --

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Jan Blum.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: -- and couldn't get
2 a response from him. Let me think about that.

3 MR. BERMAN: He's still around.

4 MS. SEGAL: Yes, he is.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

6 MS. SEGAL: Was that new business?

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That was old
8 business.

9 Moving on, discussions and presentations,
10 Mountain Lake update, number A.

11 Eileen.

12 MS. FANELLI: Well, we are working right
13 now. We are in a lull because we're working out some
14 contractual issues with Dixon Marine, but the good news
15 is we got a letter approving the RDIP from DTSC.

16 So our plan to dredge and treat has been
17 approved.

18 You see a new boat in the water. That's
19 their -- that's their barge. You saw Mark on your walk
20 the sand that had been graded there, its primary purpose
21 is to protect the wall that was discovered, the little
22 remnants of wall that seemed historic in the laydown
23 area.

24 So we ended up protecting that by filling
25 it up with sand and sloping it so they're now protected,

1 and as soon as we hopefully work through these few little
2 contract things, we'll be back out there going full
3 blast.

4 So that's where we are on Mountain Lake in
5 terms of the dredging.

6 Caltrans is almost done with their work out
7 in the -- along the edge of the highway. They have some
8 trenching to finish and backfill and some minor
9 modifications I understand to the slope.

10 We do have a date of April 15th to plant
11 some trees back along that area, and --

12 MS. KRAMER: Along the highway?

13 MS. FANELLI: Between the highway and the
14 lake, and that's being done in conjunction with our
15 forestry folks and natural resources folks. They're also
16 planning to plant some native plants along there.

17 I do have a figure for you on the -- I
18 don't know if it's a separate topic, but we had this
19 discussion last month about the north arm.

20 I made several copies. If I don't have
21 enough, I can make some more, and Mark had some comments
22 on the north arm and then followed up with his letter.

23 We do have the data results, so here, I'll
24 pass that around. I do know your letter's been responded
25 to.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I surprised myself
2 with the prolific outpouring.

3 MS. FANELLI: Yes. It was longer than the
4 workplan.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I had an
6 interesting experience.

7 MR. CHESTER: It was a workplan.

8 MS. FANELLI: I understand your letter had
9 some concern that we would miss any contamination. Our
10 sampling indeed found some lead above cleanup levels in
11 the sediment; not below the upper pipe, but below the
12 lower pipe.

13 And so based on this, we are preparing a
14 workplan at DTSC's direction to do a little bit -- not a
15 little bit. To fully characterize that sediment
16 downstream, and then the concept is that it would be
17 removed under the existing RAP, because the cleanout of
18 the pipe and the sampling was all an element of the RAP.

19 So it's part of the work that was
20 envisioned an articulated with the RAP. We don't know
21 how much we're removing at this point because we have to
22 do some additional sampling, and I'm sure when we get
23 that sampling plan, we will e-mail it to the RAB, as
24 well, so that you'll have a chance to take a look at it.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It looks like

1 350 -- is that 850 down there?

2 MR. CHESTER: It looks like it.

3 MS. FANELLI: There is. There's a high
4 one at 850. So they took them at different elevations,
5 as you can see.

6 Obviously as you get to the bottom where we
7 think that the native original interface is, we don't see
8 significant lead.

9 We do see the sediment that washed out, and
10 that's what we anticipated we would see. That's what we
11 were targeting.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Interesting. Okay.
13 We look forward to the workplan.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Can you explain it a little
15 bit more to us non-scientists? This graph 135 to 160,
16 what is that?

17 MS. FANELLI: I'm sorry.

18 MR. CHESTER: Elevation.

19 MS. FANELLI: Those are elevations.

20 MS. CHEEVER: Above the sea level, so to
21 speak?

22 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Lake level. And in what?

24 MS. FANELLI: These are in feet, and
25 it's -- I think the mean sea level elevation.

1 So what Julie's asking about is the cross-
2 section here. So this is a profile showing elevation
3 along the pipeline, so this section. These are
4 elevations.

5 So what we targeted was sediment that would
6 have been deposited from the lower and the upper pipe in
7 this wedge between here and the open water, and indeed
8 when we sampled, we wanted to sample the wedge and then a
9 little bit deeper.

10 The material in the wedge is the stuff with
11 the higher lead. In some cases, we didn't get to a below
12 cleanup level.

13 We only took two samples in those
14 locations, but we did confirm that the sediment from the
15 lower pipe down at least we know has lead that's going to
16 need to be removed.

17 The one sample that we have between the two
18 pipes did not detect any contamination. We're not all
19 that surprised necessarily about that because it's a
20 newer pipe that was installed at some point later in
21 time, but we don't know when it was installed.

22 It doesn't mean we may not take more
23 additional samples up there just to confirm it, but it
24 looks like the original pipe that was put in at the time
25 the highway was constructed carried the sediment and the

1 runoff from the highway that had the higher lead.

2 MR. CHESTER: What does the OG -- there's
3 an arrow above the station 10 in the profile? It says --
4 it's in the legend, as well. OG profile?

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Original ground or
6 something.

7 MR. CHESTER: Oh, original ground.

8 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. We tried to
9 anticipate the original ground based on the as-built
10 drawings that we had and draw a line between there and
11 the lake, and then we looked at current ground to try to
12 get a concept of how much sediment would have been
13 deposited in the wedge.

14 MR. BERMAN: So does this mean that the
15 sediment is below -- the old pipe is going to be removed?

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They're going to
17 remove the sediment.

18 MS. FANELLI: The sediment below the
19 mouth, not below the pipe itself.

20 MR. BERMAN: Oh, just at the mouth.

21 MS. FANELLI: At the mouth towards the
22 lake. So you can see in the upper plan view, the pipe
23 ends before it gets to the lake.

24 So we sampled sediment downstream of that
25 that would have been dropped out of suspension as surface

1 water came through the pipe and discharged. That's the
2 material that we were concerned might have lead in it.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They have to
4 excavate enough sediment from the end of that lower pipe
5 to the lake so the water flows naturally again without
6 backing up inside the pipes.

7 MR. BERMAN: And we can be done without
8 having to remove the pipe?

9 MS. FANELLI: The pipe at this point
10 doesn't necessarily have to be moved.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The sediment has to
12 be moved.

13 MS. FANELLI: The lower pipe is not
14 buried. It's not completely buried. You can see a
15 portion of it. It's partially got sediment in it. It's
16 more like a little pool there and then it's built up down
17 below.

18 So we have to do some more characteri-
19 zation. We don't know how much more downstream we have
20 to take out down here.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

22 MS. FANELLI: The water's still close, but
23 you're right. There's a little pool that's sort of
24 wetland area where the water does kind of puddle.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: One of my comments

1 was this roadside drain up here and conduit, they found a
2 sinkhole that was blocking the right there and they
3 couldn't find the manhole that it was supposed to connect
4 to. It looks like it just discharges down the embankment
5 there.

6 MS. FANELLI: Actually the pipe does come
7 all the way down. There is no manhole. It just
8 discharges open, and there's a little pool down there
9 that it sort of discharges in to and has gouged out.

10 So there is no manhole, but the pipe
11 doesn't surface flow off the pipe. They have found the
12 pipe going down the hill to the pre-channel.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So there was no
14 sampling out that outlet, then? Would that be added to
15 the next?

16 MS. FANELLI: They're going to sample this
17 whole area to make sure we know between our current
18 limits of excavation up the channel how much needs to be
19 removed.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And I actually
21 borrowed your idea of the delta in my comments, but I
22 said basically where the stream hits the lake, it would
23 make a delta. You know what I mean?

24 Like the Mississippi hits the ocean and the
25 delta's right at the interface. There would be a delta

1 up there.

2 MS. FANELLI: Right, right. We think what
3 we've discovered is that there is sort of a depositional
4 environment below the mouth of the pipe, too.

5 There could be times if there was enough
6 flow through the pipe for it to be erosive, but there's
7 also times when the flow is gentle enough that it's just
8 depositing sediment below there.

9 So we tried to target what we thought would
10 have been -- what could have been deposited and now we're
11 going to do some additional sampling, and that was based
12 on the as-builts.

13 We knew that the existing ground was higher
14 than the design drawings show when the pipe was installed
15 or the as-builts show when the pipe was installed.

16 So we felt that that was some evidence that
17 there had been deposition in this area.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Can I ask another question,
19 though? Is this the highway along here?

20 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

21 MS. CHEEVER: And what's this?

22 MS. FANELLI: That's the trail.

23 MS. CHEEVER: That's the trail. Okay. So
24 it sounds like this pipe, this little one is still being
25 used because of runoff from the highway goes into it?

1 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Is part of the agreement
3 that Caltrans will correct that or not?

4 MS. FANELLI: Yes. All of the inlets at
5 this point that discharge to the lake have treatment
6 units in the catch basins. There is no untreated water
7 being discharged into Mountain Lake.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Right. Including this one
9 right here?

10 MS. FANELLI: Including that one.

11 Ultimately when the diversion project goes
12 through, they'll just get rid of those drop inlets.
13 There will be no direct discharge from the highway at all
14 into the lake.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Now this pipe, is this being
16 used?

17 MS. FANELLI: Yes, it is.

18 MS. CHEEVER: So the highway's up here.

19 MS. FANELLI: That pipe carries primarily
20 water from MacArthur Tunnel's dewatering system. It
21 carries groundwater, and it flows continuously, I want to
22 say.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Twenty gallons a
24 minute.

25 MS. FANELLI: Twenty, 25, thirty gallons

1 per minute, something like that.

2 MS. CHEEVER: The MacArthur Tunnel
3 dewatering?

4 MS. FANELLI: Right.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There was some
6 water, right where the drop boxes are. Some of the pipes
7 are coming out of the hillsides.

8 MS. FANELLI: There is a little bit of
9 highway water that goes in into there, but again, at this
10 point in time, they're being treated by inserts into the
11 drop inlets.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So there's a steady
13 flow from the MacArthur Tunnel and dropping into that
14 first drop box.

15 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And there is --
17 across the street, there's two more little pipes flowing
18 spring water and they all join and then go out the main
19 pipe.

20 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's quite an
22 interesting freshwater source for the stream.

23 MS. CHEEVER: What was the MacArthur
24 Tunnel polluted from?

25 MS. FANELLI: It's from underneath.

1 MS. CHEEVER: So this water isn't
2 necessarily polluted?

3 MS. FANELLI: No, it's not. It's
4 groundwater.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's fresh
6 groundwater, and then stormwater with runoff from the
7 highway joins that during rain events and then it's a
8 combined flow.

9 Fresh water, twenty gallons a minute plus
10 whatever the storm event would be could be a lot, more
11 than twenty gallons per minute, carrying the lead
12 contaminated sediment with it.

13 So it's only during a storm that it gets
14 added to that system and comes -- but it all funnels out
15 and comes down that pipe.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Mountain Lake. Wait. It
17 funnels into this -- stuff from the highway comes off and
18 gets into the pipe at the top.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Up until this
20 point.

21 MS. FANELLI: There's a few catch basins.
22 It's somewhat of a complicated system, but that's why
23 Caltrans is redefining the flow and separating out the
24 drainage from MacArthur Tunnel, the underdrain system
25 from the highway surface runoff, and the highway surface

1 runoff ultimately will not discharge at all directly into
2 Mountain Lake. It will be discharged to sewer or the
3 overflow pipeline separately.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So once the
5 conduits are cleaned of sediment and the sediment removes
6 below the pipe, there shouldn't be contamination.

7 MR. BERMAN: It will be continuous
8 freshwater flow.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Which is a pretty
10 good flow for a little --

11 MR. BERMAN: That all goes into the lake.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And the lake.

13 MS. FANELLI: I'm sure it keeps the creek
14 healthy.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: 200 feet of pipe
16 from the north arm. It's a flowing creek with a sand bed
17 inside of the marsh sediment.

18 MS. FANELLI: That's probably why you have
19 a little wetland plant there.

20 MR. BERMAN: Who owns the lower pipe?

21 MS. FANELLI: It's part of the highway
22 design. So Caltrans is responsible.

23 MR. BERMAN: So is it -- is it still
24 theirs?

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Even though their

1 camera couldn't get through and it hit water and
2 sediment, there wasn't water backing up and flowing out
3 the upper pipe.

4 So the twenty gallons a minute is still
5 going into that pipe and flowing through the blockage. I
6 guess it's very porous sediment, I guess.

7 Presumably in a big storm event, though,
8 that pipe would fill and then the upper pipe would flow.

9 MR. BERMAN: Right. But if there is
10 sediment blocking it and that sediment is not going to be
11 removed, does that -- isn't there some --

12 MS. FANELLI: The requirement is that --
13 in the RAP is that the pipes will be cleaned.

14 MR. BERMAN: Okay.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If they don't
16 remove that sediment, that pipe doesn't function
17 properly.

18 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They have to
20 basically remove the sediment below the pipe, drop the
21 level of the water so that water doesn't back up back in
22 the pipes anymore and the flow is unimpeded.

23 If you take out the sediment coming in from
24 the catch basins, maybe it will be open now.

25 MR. BERMAN: Is that going to be Caltrans'

1 responsibility to clean up that pipe?

2 MS. FANELLI: Yes, it is.

3 MS. CHEEVER: When you say MacArthur
4 Tunnel dewatering system, is that a natural phenomenon?

5 MS. FANELLI: It was installed when they
6 built the tunnel?

7 MS. CHEEVER: What does that mean? The
8 groundwater's all channeled into --

9 MS. FANELLI: Into a drainage system
10 underneath the highway and discharges to the lake.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Through the pipe.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Trenches and pipes.
13 It keeps the road dry.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Otherwise water would
15 drop on to the roadway.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And -- yeah.

17 MS. FANELLI: It probably has structural
18 issues. You don't want those forces on your tunnel.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Most all tunnels
20 have dewatering, so it's a natural. It's an artificial
21 situation in a natural system.

22 You're putting a hole under the ground
23 through the groundwater, so the water has to come out.
24 So --

25 MR. BERMAN: Did Caltrans look to do any

1 seismic upgrade when the portions for the support for the
2 tunnel were exposed as part of the cleanup?

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Well, the stone
4 columns were seismic retrofit of the embankment.

5 MR. BERMAN: Mm-hmm, but not -- but they
6 don't support the -- they're not columns that actually
7 support the road, though? That's just for the embankment
8 itself?

9 MS. FANELLI: It supports -- it supports
10 the integrity of the roadway, yes. So that the roadway
11 will not fail or liquefy in a seismic event.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It relieves the
13 water pressure so the road doesn't liquefy and collapse.
14 It's part of the seismic retrofit of the roadway.

15 MR. BERMAN: But the actual columns itself
16 were not -- nothing was done with those?

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Those are the
18 seismic retrofit. Basically the stone columns
19 themselves. Because I believe they leave an open space
20 so the water pressure can build up and go up -- escape to
21 the atmospheric pressure inside the whole, rather than
22 building up and collapsing, whatever.

23 This relieves that pressure before the
24 ground experiences liquefaction.

25 So it is -- a lot of its seismic retrofit,

1 the purpose of it, and it's commonly used in seismic
2 retrofitting highways.

3 Here it serves dual purpose, to keep it
4 from sliding.

5 MR. BERMAN: I didn't realize that. I
6 always thought it was just an embankment improvement.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: You know, it's
8 mainly used for liquefaction. So whether they killed two
9 birds with one stone, I don't know.

10 Okay.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Wait. I had some more
12 questions.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Fire away.

14 MS. CHEEVER: When is the date of the new
15 workplan?

16 MS. FANELLI: Soon. I don't have a date.
17 Genevieve's working on it. She's on vacation next week,
18 so it may not be until the week after, but it will be
19 soon.

20 MS. CHEEVER: Okay. And then also -- I
21 know you're doing a response to Mark's comments, but
22 would it be correct to say that what's been said here,
23 the response to some of them, but some of them have not
24 yet been responded to in the discussion? They may be
25 responded to.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's fair to say.

2 MS. CHEEVER: And then --

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The main gist of
4 what I was saying in my comments is more sampling needed
5 to be done.

6 By doing the follow-up sampling to find the
7 extent of the contamination addresses a lot of my
8 comments.

9 MS. CHEEVER: If other members of the
10 public wanted to comment, could they do that? Maybe they
11 should wait until the new workplan comes out.

12 MS. FANELLI: You know, I think members of
13 the public can talk to whoever they want to whenever they
14 want to.

15 So I wouldn't give you advice on it, but
16 you could certainly -- we're going to make a copy of the
17 next iteration of the workplan available, and you can
18 comment before or after to DTSC.

19 MS. CHEEVER: But there's still not a
20 formal public comment process?

21 MS. FANELLI: There's no formal public
22 comment process, no. Because this work was envisioned
23 and required as an element of the DTSC approved RAP and
24 the RAP was subject to public comment and review.

25 Is there -- maybe you all can explain to me

1 a little bit more about -- Mark brought it up in his
2 letter and now, Julie, you've brought it up -- this
3 public comment issue or concern.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Well, it's -- you
5 know, it's got of morphing here, so consider my answer in
6 terms of what you've just been saying.

7 But, you know, it's part of the public
8 participation plan of Mountain Lake. So it seemed like
9 an addendum to the workplan would kick out some kind of
10 public participation.

11 Now, whether there's a formal public
12 comment period or just providing the public with
13 information and an opportunity to comment, I'm not sure
14 how that really works, but my guess -- my feelings were
15 as part of the formal public participation plan, any new
16 workplan would go to public comment.

17 Now, I'm not sure why I'm saying that
18 exactly, but -- in other words, the workplan that already
19 went out was approved by DTSC without public comment.
20 But that stuff happened fast.

21 MS. SEGAL: Other ways, a mailing could go
22 out and talk about the plans and what's going on to a
23 general mailing population.

24 Would -- are you saying that the additional
25 information or new work should be sort of discussed

1 publicly somewhere or at least available?

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The way it sort of
3 happened was the plan went to DTSC for approval and then
4 the plan said that the results of this sampling will be
5 used to determine if further work is needed.

6 MS. SEGAL: Right.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So we make a
8 decision. It's a decision document the way it was
9 written. We're going to do six samples or how many and
10 they were going to make a decision on whether further
11 work was needed.

12 DTSC approved that. My problem was I
13 didn't think it had enough samples, actually, to give
14 confidence that it could find contamination.

15 Especially if it's -- the contamination was
16 more widespread than I thought it was going to be and it
17 turns out it was pretty straightforward to find.

18 I thought a stream environment would make
19 it hard to find, but apparently a lot of material might
20 have entered the system.

21 Since this workplan was submitted by DTSC,
22 the samples were going to be taken, the results from the
23 laboratory and a decision made. I just thought that
24 should involve some public participation.

25 What do you think, Julie?

1 MS. CHEEVER: I guess I need to think
2 about it a bit more, but I was affected by these
3 comments, that there wasn't public comment and that it
4 seemed like --

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Maybe it's a moot
6 point because we're moving forward into another workplan.

7 MS. FANELLI: It won't be offered for
8 public review, formal thirty-day public review.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No.

10 MS. FANELLI: It's -- we share information
11 with you because you're the RAB and that's how we do it.
12 But it's not -- it's not subject to formal review.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I can follow up
14 with our DTSC public relations specialist and get a
15 feeling what the actual requirements are.

16 Does anybody remember her name?

17 MS. FANELLI: Radhika?

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: She's the public
19 relations person in Sacramento?

20 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

21 MR. BERMAN: What has been the
22 participation or -- the dwellers of the Mountain Lake
23 area that have this association? Have they been involved
24 in any of -- of these discussions other than showing up
25 at that public meeting a while ago? Friends of Mountain

1 Lake I guess they're called.

2 MS. FANELLI: I believe that they have
3 been very -- they were very active through the RAP
4 approval process.

5 They attended all the public information
6 sessions and meetings and I know the Trust did outreach
7 and went to a few of their community meetings and
8 answered questions.

9 The Trust is doing a mailing periodically
10 on activities at Mountain Lake. They are included on
11 that mailing.

12 MS. CHEEVER: The name is actually Friends
13 of Mountain Lake Park.

14 MS. FANELLI: They get the same public
15 communications. Less than you get because they don't sit
16 here at the table with us, but they get the outreach
17 materials that are provided by the Trust.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm not advocating
19 right now for a public comment period on this unless
20 someone feels it's really necessary.

21 It was more of a contingency for me if no
22 contamination was found, looking at the worst case kind
23 of in a strange way.

24 MR. BERMAN: Because it was not a dense
25 enough sampling.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Exactly. So to me,
2 the public participation part of -- in case that
3 happened, a decision was made to not investigate further
4 or something like this.

5 So I'm not advocating for a public comment
6 period right now unless someone else thinks it's
7 necessary.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Okay. Let's see what the
9 new workplan says.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. That was
11 actually topic C.

12 MS. FANELLI: I have.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Baker Beach.

14 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I have some drawings.
15 The RDIP for Baker Beach is -- previous a preliminary
16 draft that we're working with now and we're hoping that
17 we'll have a final draft in the next several weeks and
18 that will be posted and you'll be able to get copies of
19 that.

20 That said, I didn't make copies for
21 everybody here, but I have sets that you all can share
22 that shows you the excavation plan -- here's another set.
23 And the excavation plan for the waste material, and then
24 the final -- essentially the final grading plan.

25 Okay. So I believe that it is the figure

1 on the backside. We'll start there. Yours isn't in
2 color. That's the current excavation plan. It's a
3 similar plan to what was in the FS/RAP, and this is a
4 plan -- I think this is probably from the FS/RAP.

5 We have in our Draft RDIP a confirmation
6 sampling plan. We will likely do preconfirmation
7 sampling to hopefully define the lateral extent of
8 removal and we'll be doing that we hope in the next
9 several weeks pending DTSC approval.

10 Right. So these --

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Here's the coastal trail.
12 It drops off right away.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is the new coastal
14 trail.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: It's steep.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: This is the new trail
17 location roughly. The existing trail was here.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: And then the dropoff is a
20 little bit further out. The dropoff is at the end of the
21 excavation.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: So then this is just steep.

23 MS. FANELLI: All right. So this figure
24 just -- it gives you an idea of where we're going to be
25 excavating. It's not a surprising figure because it's in

1 the FS/RAP and it will be in the Final FS/RAP.

2 The RDIP that will be posted I hope in the
3 next several weeks, the final draft that you'll get to
4 see, it will have information on our confirmation
5 sampling plan.

6 Essentially we've laid a grid across this
7 area, and based on that grid are collecting samples.

8 We wanted to define the edges of
9 excavation, particularly in the southern boundary and the
10 northern boundary as much as we can in advance.

11 It's easier for the contractor. They dig
12 to a line. Very similar to what we did at CHP range and
13 very similar to what we do on lead-based paint soil.

14 We know we can't get the bottoms, so we'll
15 be sampling the bottoms as we clear an area, but if we
16 can get edges cleared in advance, it's a little bit
17 faster and a little bit smoother. So you'll see that in
18 the RDIP.

19 Then the plan on top or that was on top.
20 This one is essentially the final grading plan, and, you
21 know, Brian, you could certainly talk more about this,
22 but this is what was worked through with Brian's group
23 and the Conservancy to reflect the --

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: It reflects the historic
25 configuration the best that we can do.

1 MR. BERMAN: So will there be a trail that
2 actually goes down to the beach, then?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: In this specific segment,
4 the trail was up immediately adjacent to the concrete
5 fortifications, at the top of the soil, but the beach --
6 the trails at the beach are elsewhere, not this specific
7 short segment.

8 MR. BERMAN: Further west?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Further south.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: South.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: It's down here.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Plus the battery
13 trail, which is the next section.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Over to the Baker Beach 2
15 area. That one does have a pure that goes down to the
16 beach.

17 MR. BERMAN: That's what I was thinking
18 of, right. And that's --

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: And that trail segment is
20 done.

21 MR. BERMAN: Mm-hmm. So is that going to
22 have any -- will there be a fence there or -- what's
23 going to keep people from using that area to go down to
24 the beach?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's very steep.

1 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: So at this point, the
3 intent is not to put up any permanent fencing. Until the
4 vegetation gets established, there may be some temporary
5 or short-term fencing, but the idea is that historically
6 there was no fencing there --

7 MR. BERMAN: Right.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: -- or at least something
9 that wasn't visible.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: About this tall.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: And so I think the
12 cultural folks would like to maintain that fortification
13 like appearance and I think that they'll try to use other
14 methods to keep people on the trail versus a fence.

15 MS. FANELLI: So in terms of if -- the --
16 I can explain the grading plan if you like a little bit
17 more, but it's basically as Brian described, and then the
18 Conservancy or Park Service would come in afterwards and
19 finalize their new trail surface and all of that kind of
20 good work.

21 There is some public outreach materials
22 being prepared. I know there was a draft, Brian. I just
23 got it today. It's actually circulating; not between you
24 and me, but circulating between Alex and Dana and maybe
25 you already got a copy.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: I talked to Alex briefly
2 about it today.

3 MS. FANELLI: So you have a copy. Okay.

4 MR. CHESTER: What's the difference
5 between the conform line and the equipment restriction
6 zone? Is there work in those margins or is that --

7 MS. FANELLI: There is work in those
8 margins, but we'll have to reach. We don't have
9 equipment getting close to the batteries or close to the
10 cliff face.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: And the conform line is
12 the western edge of where fill is placed.

13 MR. CHESTER: Mm-hmm.

14 MS. FANELLI: That's based on geotechnical
15 concerns for the most part, slope stability.

16 MR. CHESTER: It would be reaching down.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: So there's -- excavation
18 goes all the way out to the edge, but the equipment will
19 have to reach that last ten or fifteen feet to get to it.

20 MS. FANELLI: So you will see some public
21 information pieces I hope out there within the next
22 several weeks, similar to the brochures we print out for
23 Mountain Lake.

24 We're going to try to have a map that shows
25 the parking lot closures, the trail reroute for this

1 area.

2 We anticipate fencing off Baker Beach 1A
3 and 2 at the same time. You will be able to get to the
4 overlook, but you will not be able to walk the trail
5 between there by the batteries.

6 But there is a detour that's been
7 identified. So we will have some brochures out, then the
8 fences will go out and we will also have some project
9 information coordinators like we do on Mountain Lake and
10 other sites, try to wandering and try to help folks.

11 MS. SEGAL: The trail's now strictly
12 pedestrian?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Now they --

14 MS. SEGAL: Mountain Lake?

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: People do use mountain
16 bikes, but they're not designed for it. The new trails
17 will be multi-use. It will be ABOTA standards, which is
18 an accessibility standard. It will be wide enough that
19 it will handle pedestrians and bicyclists.

20 MS. FANELLI: So these projects are moving
21 along. We are interviewing contractors tomorrow and
22 we're hoping to make our selection on a contractor next
23 week.

24 I anticipate that if everything went
25 swimmingly, we could be out in the field as early as mid-

1 May on Baker Beach 1A, followed by Baker Beach 2 maybe a
2 month or so later.

3 So May would be an early start. June or
4 July would be a late start if things don't go swimmingly.

5 But I hope that you all get what we wish
6 for, which is good weather and good conditions and
7 agreements and stuff so we can get going on it.

8 MS. SEGAL: What's the access right now,
9 though?

10 MS. FANELLI: Right now the site's open --

11 MS. SEGAL: It is.

12 MS. FANELLI: -- to formal access.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: And the vegetation has
14 been mostly cleared, so it's quite different than it was.

15 MS. SEGAL: I haven't been out there. I
16 have to get over there.

17 MS. FANELLI: It's not on the agenda, but
18 I took the liberty to make a couple copies of the Baker
19 Beach 2 to show folks. So it's the same thing, two
20 figures. If you guys can pass them down and share them.

21 Basically the first figure 1 just shows the
22 area that will be excavated. We will likely have a same
23 confirmation grid.

24 We will potentially do some pre-excavation
25 confirmation sampling because we like to be able to tell

1 the contractor to go here. Just makes life sampler than
2 having him dig, grab a sample, then we have to dig some
3 more, grab a sample. It's a little easier.

4 We will not get bottom samples, obviously,
5 beforehand, but we could do perimeter.

6 MS. SEGAL: On the excavation projects,
7 what are we talking about in terms of truckload?

8 MS. FANELLI: Yes. Actual -- that's
9 actually in the RAPs, the FS/RAPs. I forget how many
10 truckloads. I know this is 6,700 yards estimated.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's 1,400
12 truckloads, my recollection. I may be off, but --

13 MS. FANELLI: The second picture is the
14 current spot without all of the engineering analysis
15 being completed on the regrading -- yes. So figure 2.

16 Figure 2 and figure 1 look very similar,
17 but essentially we would -- we would take the stuff out
18 and then we would bring in -- actually not an
19 insignificant amount of fill, not a hundred percent, but
20 half or more to get a stable slope and rebuild this area.
21 So that's just source of a glimpse of that.

22 MS. KRAMER: It looks pretty steep,
23 actually, the grading in there.

24 Is it?

25 MS. FANELLI: The final grading? It's

1 not. It's three to one. So I guess it depends if you
2 think three to one is steep.

3 The engineers would like four to one, but
4 it's three to one, which is less steep than -- certainly
5 a lot less steep than landfill 10, for example.

6 MS. KRAMER: Are they going to put like
7 netting?

8 MS. FANELLI: Oh, everything will be --
9 yes. Everything will always have all of those types
10 of -- now, I did not print these for you. They are
11 draft, but if you want -- I'll pass it around.

12 This just gives you an idea of the existing
13 grade, the excavation grade and then the proposed refill
14 grade so you can get an idea of that.

15 MS. KRAMER: So it gets less steep,
16 actually.

17 MS. FANELLI: Right. Right now, it's --
18 it doesn't have a great stability profile.

19 When we remove it, we'll be making it more
20 stable. When we backfill, we want to continue to
21 maintain any improvements in stability that we achieve by
22 removing the break.

23 Brian has a set of these.

24 MR. BERMAN: It's pretty impressive the
25 way the changes are -- when you look how the old Baker

1 Beaches were with the overgrown -- the overgrowth and the
2 trees and shrubs and everything and you look at it now
3 with the change in the trail.

4 I mean, it's -- to me, that's the most
5 dramatic part of the cleanup in terms of the changes and
6 the configurations, the reconfigurations that have been
7 done of which the public will, you know, in a sense enjoy
8 that.

9 I think somehow that to me is the real
10 benefit of all this work in terms of making something
11 really beautiful for the public and that wasn't there
12 before, and probably one of the best trails in -- in the
13 five county Bay Area.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Battery to Bluff
15 Trail is quite spectacular. If you haven't been out
16 there and walking, walk that trail.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Is it washed out or not?

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: The new coastal trail is
19 washed out. The battery trail isn't, and if you look
20 at -- where Baker Beach 3 was, it's been almost ten years
21 now, I think, that that cleanup has done. That site has
22 recovered.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you start at
24 kind of Baker Beach access, you walk right past landfill
25 3 restoration, and then drop down into the other valley.

1 It's quite spectacular. Very well done.

2 MS. SEGAL: Are you going to lead a field
3 trip?

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. Summer. We
5 could meet there and have burritos and walk down.

6 MR. BERMAN: Where do you start it with
7 the Baker Beach parking lot?

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Above where the
9 sand steps start. You're up on Lincoln, can park up
10 above Baker Beach.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Sand ladder.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Next to the sand
13 ladder, the road. That's the start, the road access to
14 the battery.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's Crosby.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Battery Crosby.
17 You walk the road out to Battery Crosby. It starts from
18 the top of the battery, drops down into the next canyon
19 to the north and goes down to the beach and then comes
20 back up closer to where --

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: Just to the south edge of
22 Baker Beach Disturbed Area 2.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

24 MR. CHESTER: It's great. I agree.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Very nice trip.

1 MR. BERMAN: I haven't actually done it,
2 but I've just looked at it from a couple vantage points
3 and it looks pretty spectacular.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a very popular
5 trail. Rightly low so, because it really takes you on
6 those cliffs.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's safe now. It
8 used to be kind of scary. The trails were steep and
9 pretty hazardous. There's a lot of interesting activity
10 down there that we won't go in to.

11 MR. BERMAN: Is that actually going to be
12 open to mountain bakes, too?

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No.

14 MR. BERMAN: Hopefully not.

15 MR. CHESTER: Too steep.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a stairway.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
18 questions on Baker Beach 2? Any of the design plans.
19 Anything else, Eileen?

20 MS. FANELLI: No. I think that covers it,
21 what I had tonight.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Moving on to
23 new business. Anybody have any new business to talk
24 about?

25 One item that I wanted to introduce here.

1 It was a letter February 19th, 2013 from the Department
2 of Toxic Substances Control. Went around by e-mail, I
3 think. We all got it. Passed it around.

4 The DTSC is asking for a Preliminary
5 Endangerment Assessment Workplan, and the rest of the
6 letter talks about the Lindrom Court site, which is
7 another debris fillsite, has broken glass and soil,
8 debris fill mixed with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons,
9 dioxin and feuron levels exceeding Presidio cleanup
10 levels.

11 The next paragraph asks for the workplan,
12 but it's not clear if it's just for the Lindrom Court
13 site itself or for some list that referred to in that
14 paragraph.

15 Did you get a chance to reread that?

16 MS. FANELLI: Which date that letter?

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: February 19th.

18 MS. FANELLI: This is just for Lindrom
19 Court.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. It was
21 confusing. They started off saying the letter from the
22 DTSC to the Presidio Trust.

23 MS. FANELLI: There's an earlier letter.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Lindrom Court was
25 listed as one of numerous areas where releases of

1 hazardous substances or hazardous waste may have
2 occurred.

3 Given the available information, DTSC
4 requests that the Trust submits a Preliminary
5 Endangerment Assessment Workplan.

6 So the way they word it, it makes it sound
7 like the workplan is for one of these numerous areas.

8 MS. FANELLI: I can clarify it. The
9 letter that's referenced in there is dated the 12th that
10 talks about the miscellaneous sites, and that has a
11 process they've asked us to go through for the
12 miscellaneous sites and we're getting ready to initiate
13 that activity, and they also talk about additional sites.

14 In the case of Lindrom Court, the Trust in
15 December of 20th sent a separate letter saying hey, we've
16 discovered this area of potential contamination. Please
17 advise what you would like us to do, and this letter is
18 specifically in response to that, as well, where they ask
19 for the workplan to complete a PEA on it.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So the numerous
21 area refers back to miscellaneous sites?

22 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

24 MS. FANELLI: That's -- referring back to
25 the letter --

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

2 MS. FANELLI: -- dated the 12th.

3 MR. BERMAN: It's strange that they don't
4 say -- they don't recognize that it was the Trust that
5 discovered this. When I read that, it looks like DTSC
6 sent their spies out there and they discovered.

7 MS. FANELLI: No. We told them in
8 December that we had found this area.

9 MR. BERMAN: Right, but they don't
10 acknowledge that in this letter, at all.

11 MS. SEGAL: The first paragraphs thanks
12 them.

13 MS. FANELLI: Thanks us for sending the
14 letter.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: "Thank you for your
16 December 13th letter informing the department of the
17 likely presence of debris fill beneath Lindrom Court in
18 the north Fort Scott area of the Presidio."

19 Could you tell us a little bit about where
20 it is a little better?

21 MS. FANELLI: It's off of that street,
22 Lindrom Court.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Up there on top
24 where the Fort Scott area is?

25 MS. FANELLI: It's to the north of Doyle,

1 I think is the area, Lindrom Court.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Where the housing is?

3 MS. FANELLI: Yes, it is, and it's an area
4 where tenants started to complain about glass and we went
5 out there to try to figure out what was going on, and
6 this was about the time Doyle was doing a lot of
7 construction in that area.

8 So we figured that the Doyle construction
9 shook the ground and disturbed all gophers and the
10 gophers started digging up stuff, and there was a lot of
11 glass, and it looked a little melted. It was odd.

12 So we did a few test pits and we discovered
13 there's -- in many -- in most places, a significant cover
14 of dirt that's got the grass growing on it, but
15 underneath that, there's a thin layer of debris that
16 looks like it came from a potential incinerator.

17 We grabbed a few samples and the truth is
18 it didn't have really high contaminant concentrations in
19 it, but it was just a couple of samples that we got out
20 of one test pit.

21 So we let DTSC know and now -- we asked for
22 their guidance, and so they've given it to us. We
23 have -- we'll do a Preliminary Endangerment Workplan for
24 that area, we'll implement that workplan.

25 EKI has given me a proposal for that.

1 That's who the Trust is contracting with, and then we'll
2 see what it says, and then we'll look at -- we don't even
3 know what the extent is.

4 We know where the glass has been mapped on
5 the surface, but we don't really have a good handle on
6 what the extent is.

7 So we'll get a good handle on that and
8 we'll figure out what the remedial activity should be on
9 that site.

10 So it's considered an unknown site at this
11 point.

12 MR. BERMAN: Does that mean that some of
13 the cost will be covered by the Army?

14 MS. FANELLI: We certainly are making
15 claims against the Army as well as against the REEL
16 policy for it, yeah.

17 MR. CHESTER: I had a question on -- maybe
18 it's a summary or a status -- I could have missed it, but
19 there was a couple letters a while back and an issue
20 between the parks and DTSC and the Trust and a letter
21 that the RAB wrote, John worked on.

22 Is there any feedback or has that been --

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think you're talking
24 about the feasibility study?

25 MR. CHESTER: Yes.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Baker Beach 1A and
2 2?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: The response to summary
4 is still pending and will come out from the state at some
5 point.

6 MS. FANELLI: Right. I think it's very
7 close. My understanding is that DTSC's trying to get it
8 issued by the 20th or at least that's when we're trying
9 to get it to the printer.

10 So I know that the response to comments
11 document has been drafted and it's currently in DTSC's
12 hands. It's with Lori who's making final tweaks to it.

13 MR. CHESTER: All right.

14 MS. FANELLI: So we're anticipating that
15 coming out and having the final document by the end of
16 the month.

17 Then I'm also anticipating getting the RDIP
18 in for Baker Beach 1A, and it's in preliminary review
19 now, portions of it, get a formal draft submitted that
20 will be copied to the RAB as well in the next couple of
21 weeks.

22 MR. BERMAN: Were all the parties
23 reasonably satisfied with the outcome?

24 MS. FANELLI: Of?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: We haven't seen the

1 outcome yet.

2 MR. BERMAN: Oh, you haven't seen it?

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Two weeks.

4 MR. CHESTER: This is part of it, right?

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yes.

6 MR. CHESTER: This is the sampling plan
7 around these issues.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: The design that follows
9 the decision.

10 MR. CHESTER: Right.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
12 new business?

13 Okay. Action items and agenda items.
14 Let's see. Next month, April. On anybody's mind. We
15 can keep talking about the final report, I guess. We can
16 bring that up as a regular item.

17 MS. SEGAL: It might be a good idea at
18 some point prioritize the case history of that. There is
19 a lot of history. Let's focus on those that you think
20 are key.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I was thinking of
22 focusing on something that we can put our finger on as
23 our contribution.

24 MS. SEGAL: Right. Our directives or
25 instrumentality or whatever.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And illustrate that
2 point with the case history. I guess that's my --

3 MS. SEGAL: We need to move a letter in a
4 couple weeks.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If I get ambitious,
6 I'll try and start something.

7 Any other projects coming up that we can
8 talk about or updates? I guess Mountain Lake again.
9 That's good.

10 MS. FANELLI: The comment period for the
11 BAPR closed and there were no normal comments submitted,
12 so that final document is being prepared.

13 George Chow at DTSC is the project manager
14 and we're moving ahead with our design documents to be in
15 a position to get that constructed soon.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
17 documents coming out for view or. Lobos Creek?

18 MS. FANELLI: Lobos Creek. It should
19 actually be out by now. Yeah. That will be out I hope
20 real soon. Genevieve has been strapped on Mountain Lake
21 and some other things.

22 It's been reviewed by Park Service. We're
23 responding and making some tweaks in response to the Park
24 Service's comments and then it will be going to Lori and
25 we'll let you all know when it goes to Lori as a regular

1 document.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It will be before
3 the next RAB meeting?

4 MS. FANELLI: I really hope it is.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Should I go ahead
6 and put that on the agenda?

7 MS. FANELLI: Sure. If Genevieve's here,
8 maybe she can participate and walk you through it. It's
9 a fairly concise document.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Was it an FS
11 document?

12 MS. FANELLI: No. It's a Summary Remedial
13 Investigation Report.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. That should
15 be enough to get us started.

16 Any other comments? Speculations or
17 anything else?

18 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

19 (The meeting concluded at 8:23 PM).

20 ---o0o---

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing arbitration was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing arbitration and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2013

BUILDING 67, PRESIDIO

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Mark Youngkin, Facilitator
Eileen Fanelli
4 Brian Ullensvang
Julie Cheever
5 Gloria Gee
Toni Kramer
6 Edward Callanan
Jan Monaghan
7 John Budroe
Julie Cheever
8 John Chester
Julian Hultgren

9

Also Present:

10

Radhika Majhail

11

12

---o0o---

13

14

15

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on April 9, 2013, 7:07 PM at Building
17 67, Presidio of San Francisco, California, before me,
18 MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of California,
19 there commenced a RAB meeting under the provisions of the
20 Presidio Trust.

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements and Old Business:	5
6	4) Discussions & Presentaitons:	
7	A. Project Status Update - Eileen Fanelli	7
8	B. Lobos Creek Summary Remedial Inv Report	25
9	5) New Business:	
10	A. RAB Final Report	30
11	6) Public Comment - None	
12	7) Action Items and Agenda Items:	53
13	8) Closing:	56
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So welcome to the
2 regularly scheduled monthly meeting of the Restoration
3 Advisory Board of the Presidio San Francisco. I believe
4 if Doug Kern was still here, he would tell us this is our
5 anniversary month and that we are at nineteen years, I
6 believe.

7 Doug was sort of the keeper of the
8 historical anniversary dates. I'll have to verify that
9 with him, but nineteen years.

10 So if we do close out next year, we'll be
11 at an even twenty years.

12 Did you plan that, Eileen?

13 MS. FANELLI: I did not. I did not.

14 MR. BUDROE: What anniversary is that?

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That started --

16 MS. FANELLI: Like color or precious metal
17 or --

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Platinum?

19 MS. FANELLI: 25's silver or gold;
20 platinum's 75.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Does everyone have
22 an agenda?

23 MS. GEE: Yes.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Does anyone want to
25 add any topics or change anything? Seeing not, moving

1 on. Announcements and old business.

2 I had something carried over from last
3 month, Baker Beach Responsive Summary.

4 Does that come out?

5 MS. FANELLI: It hasn't come out. I did
6 speak with Denise Tsuji this morning. My understanding
7 was she was going to sign the FS/RAP today, and I'm
8 hoping that that's true because that's an indication that
9 she's also finished the responsive summary.

10 If I know we've gotten the final edits to
11 the FS/RAP, and think's primarily editorial, so we're
12 getting ready to produce, but I haven't gotten a copy of
13 the signed sheet from her, which I'm hoping is coming
14 tomorrow.

15 That means, then, that within the next
16 week, we would be getting it finalized, posted, and any
17 hard copies that need to be produced would be produced
18 and electronic copies will be posted.

19 And I'll let everybody know as soon as it
20 it's signed.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

22 MS. FANELLI: Then we turn around and get
23 it signed by Craig Middleton or Craig Deis or whatever.
24 It's imminent.

25 I was really hoping quite frankly and I was

1 kind of pushing DTSC to have it done before today.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Thank you
3 for that update.

4 I guess Craig and them are over at the
5 board meeting tonight?

6 MS. FANELLI: There is a board meeting
7 tonight at the Golden Gate Club.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Any environmental
9 issues on that agenda?

10 MS. FANELLI: Not that I am aware of. I
11 think the primary topic might be the proposals that were
12 received for the former come PX area for development, all
13 of which I think are posted on the Trust web page.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I haven't been
15 following that one. I think Doug used to keep track of
16 all that.

17 MS. FANELLI: There is one I know
18 submitted by Lucas, so it got some press, mainly because
19 of I think who he is.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

21 MS. FANELLI: But there are several --
22 there are sixteen proposals that I understand.

23 Also on the Baker Beach -- well on Baker
24 Beach Responsiveness Summary, but I also understand that
25 the BAPR Final Remedial Action Workplan is on Denise's

1 desk to be signed, as well.

2 So I'm expecting that one to be signed
3 tomorrow, too. I would love it if they're both signed at
4 the same time.

5 But the Baker Beach one obviously is more
6 critical path for us.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. The BAPR is
8 pretty straightforward, huh?

9 MS. FANELLI: I think it is.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Moving on to
11 item 4, discussions and presentations. Project status
12 update.

13 Eileen, do you want to run us through that?

14 MS. FANELLI: I can. Obviously the
15 projects that we're working most diligently on are the
16 remaining projects with actual remedial construction.

17 On Mountain Lake, we have contracted with
18 Dixon Marine for the Phase II work which includes the
19 actual dredging.

20 They have all of their equipment in the
21 water, so if you drive by, you will see several boats and
22 the dredge is actually in the water.

23 They have completed fusing their piping to
24 take the dredged materials to the treatment area and the
25 return water to come back. They are finishing up the

1 treatment area.

2 So as you know, we had to bring in a fair
3 amount of sand, and the purpose of that sand was to cover
4 historical foundations that were found, and the soil is
5 going to cushion them and protect them from the geotubes
6 and other materials that are going to be put on top.

7 That sand was a little wet, and so it had a
8 little bit of pumping issues, and what has happened this
9 last week is they did some treatment in the areas where
10 it was a little soft. They added some cement,
11 essentially, to dry it out.

12 They are ordering a membrane. It's a geo-
13 synthetic material that's now going to go on top of that,
14 and then actually they're going to pour concrete on top
15 of that.

16 So we're going to have a very relatively
17 robust platform that the geotubes are going to be placed
18 on.

19 The reason for the concrete essentially is
20 that we need two episodes of treatment. So we'll be
21 putting bags down, filling them, letting them dewater,
22 busting those bags open, taking away that material and
23 then laying out another set of bags.

24 In order to have a hard working surface to
25 break those bags open, they needed some concrete.

1 It also protects the material below from
2 becoming contaminated with that sediment that might wash
3 through.

4 And that is important for when we take all
5 that sand away. We don't want to have to take it away
6 and it has some sediment in it that may or may not have
7 lead that causes it to have to be disposed after at a
8 higher cost than which we otherwise would have.

9 So that material, the membrane is supposed
10 to be in this week. It'll likely be placed early. Next
11 week, the concrete will go immediately after that.

12 I understand that it isn't a large pour,
13 maybe the period of a day or two. When that's done, they
14 will also put a liner down under the water treatment
15 plant.

16 So this is the plant that will be taking
17 the effluent, if you will, and then running it through
18 filters, et cetera before we discharge it back to the
19 lake.

20 We could move on with that because if we
21 built that, we wouldn't have any room to get the actual
22 pad on.

23 But I'm hoping by the end of next week and
24 the following week that the treatment area -- we call it
25 the materials handling area, MHA, will be essentially

1 done, and then the dredge will be -- it will be primed
2 using lake water, and then actual dredged material will
3 start to go through.

4 So you'll still see over the next couple
5 weeks more work in the laydown area, and then we'll
6 hopefully start actual dredging.

7 So that project is a little bit behind. We
8 had hoped to be dredging by the end of March. We're more
9 likely not going to be dredging till the end of April,
10 and so we're probably about a month or so behind
11 schedule, and then looking for ways obviously with the
12 contractor to speed that up. So that is in process.

13 The work you will see is Caltrans. They
14 are going to be doing some night work along that western
15 edge to finish things.

16 So Caltrans is going to be working on that
17 western edge. In particular next week, we hope to be
18 planting some trees, replacement trees along that
19 embankment.

20 So you may see trees that the Trust has
21 ordered through our forestry department, slightly larger
22 than normal. They're eight foot.

23 They're specified by our Planning
24 Department, go in the ground there, and then some
25 additional erosion control fabrics, and at that point,

1 Caltrans should be pretty complete on that western edge.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The filters, then?

3 MS. FANELLI: The filters are all in.

4 They have been actually in for quite sometime.

5 They are finishing grading, final placement
6 of backfill on that western slope, and we'll be planting.

7 Our own natural resources staff are going
8 to be putting in willow stakes. Our forestry department
9 will be putting in some irrigation, putting in some
10 above-grade irrigation lines.

11 MS. KRAMER: What are the trees that are
12 going in that are eight feet tall?

13 MS. FANELLI: I think they're a type of
14 pine, but I don't know exactly.

15 MS. CHEEVER: When you say "the filters
16 are in," does that mean the drains?

17 MS. FANELLI: That is not the final
18 project to redirect and divert the runoff. It is the
19 temporary measure. So all of the drop inlets have filter
20 mechanisms in there.

21 So all the water from the highway still
22 discharges to Mountain Lake, but it is treated before
23 discharge.

24 There's another follow-on project where
25 it's the diversion project where Caltrans will ultimately

1 abandon use of those drop inlets and redirect runoff into
2 the Mountain Lake overflow pipeline.

3 MS. CHEEVER: What's the tentative timing
4 of that?

5 MS. FANELLI: I would not expect that
6 construction to happen for a couple of years, and the
7 reason is it will be coupled with -- I want to call them
8 maintenance repairs to the overflow pipeline itself, some
9 linings to the overflow pipeline.

10 And that project with the diversion has to
11 go through CEQA, and the lining, because it's being done
12 by the Trust, has to go through NEPA, and likely there
13 will be a joint CEQA/NEPA document. So there will be a
14 public review process associated with that.

15 I don't expect that public review process
16 to happen until after summer after earliest, but it
17 should be happening sometime in the next -- end of this
18 calendar year in 2014, and then I expect design would
19 happen after that, and construction after that.

20 So that's the update on Mountain Lake.

21 I think that there is a Friends of Mountain
22 Lake meeting on Thursday. Is that what you were going to
23 say?

24 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

1 MS. FANELLI: It's -- Friends of Mountain
2 Lake was hosting it.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The Trust will be
4 presenting?

5 MS. FANELLI: The Trust will be there. I
6 think it's more about enhancement follow-on projects. I
7 will not be there. I believe Genevieve will be there for
8 any questions about remediation, but Michael Boland will
9 be there and it will be more about enhancement activities
10 than remediation.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And the park.

12 MS. FANELLI: And maybe the park. They're
13 going to talk about what the Friends of Mountain Lake is
14 doing with the park.

15 But there may be some discussion about, for
16 example, the east arm project about what the Natural
17 Resources Group has.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Did you already mention the
19 north arm?

20 MS. FANELLI: I have not mentioned the
21 north arm. The north arm I -- where we are is not any
22 different than I think we were the last month.

23 We are doing a supplemental sampling plan
24 for that to determine where the sediment with lead is,
25 and once we have that plan, I had submitted to let you

1 know.

2 We have not yet submitted it to DTSC. I
3 don't think it's drafted, because we've been working on
4 some other things. But we're going to get that shortly,
5 and hopefully get that submitted.

6 We will -- I'll let you all know when it's
7 submitted and copy you on it.

8 I have spoken with Denise Tsuji and Lori
9 Coach and they are aware that you guys are obviously
10 interested in it and will be copied on it.

11 So once that plan is done, then we will
12 implement it. It would tell us what the area of sediment
13 that needs to be removed is, and then we would figure out
14 how we will remove it, and that's the current plan.

15 But we have not actually done that follow-
16 up plan yet. That's the north arm.

17 I can tell you we are installing some
18 groundwater wells around Mountain Lake, so you'll see
19 that -- well, that activity I believe happened this week.
20 Happening yesterday and today, and you may see some
21 activity on that if you're out there.

22 The purpose of the wells is not
23 remediation. It is part of the overflow diversion
24 project, and it's to quantify changes of storage in
25 Mountain Lake in order to understand how those changes of

1 storage affect discharge out of the Mountain Lake
2 overflow pipeline.

3 So those wells are going in, and I believe
4 Natural Resources is installing some additional wells in
5 conjunction with the City on City property, and they will
6 probably happen a little later in time.

7 Any other questions on Mountain Lake? I
8 think I've covered everything that I have on that.

9 MR. CHESTER: That north arm sampling
10 isn't going to be that -- at overall lake work that's
11 going on?

12 MS. FANELLI: They're connected.

13 MR. CHESTER: But not having the sampling
14 plans initiated or is there -- do you get the sampling
15 plan done sooner --

16 MS. FANELLI: We need to get the sampling
17 plans done --

18 MR. CHESTER: In order not to harm the
19 other schedule.

20 MS. FANELLI: It will probably not being
21 removed using the dredging equipment. Depending on the
22 extent, it may be removed with hand tools and hand
23 equipment. It may be that kind of delicate an operation.

24 I would like to have the plan done, but we
25 only have so many resources.

1 MR. CHESTER: Right.

2 MS. FANELLI: And we're going as fast as
3 we can on that one.

4 We were trying to get -- I said earlier
5 that we're about a month behind on the dredging, and so
6 our priority has been to get that going and keep that
7 from slipping, and then we'll focus on the sampling plan
8 for the north arm.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Can you remind us
10 of what the north arm was proposed for? Is that
11 restoration area?

12 MS. FANELLI: I don't think the Trust has
13 any plans, formal plans at this point as to what to do
14 with that north arm, with the Natural Resources Group.

15 Originally we were avoiding it to avoid
16 impacts to wetland areas and other resources in there at
17 the beginning of the project.

18 Now we have to go in there and remove a
19 certain amount of sediment, but to my knowledge,
20 unless -- I don't have a Natural Resources representative
21 here. There isn't a defined plan with what to do with
22 that north arm at this point in time.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They may be working
24 on that.

25 MS. FANELLI: They may be. Natural

1 Resources may be.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I was also
3 wondering about the pipe itself, there are two pipes.
4 Two pipes.

5 Is there an agreement with Caltrans to
6 clean the pipes? They agreed to that?

7 MS. FANELLI: If you read the RAP requires
8 that Caltrans clean the pipes and sample. So we've done
9 the sampling and we found some contamination.

10 So we're going to do enough additional
11 sampling to remove that contaminated material.

12 Caltrans is looking at cleaning the pipes.
13 Cleaning the upper pipe is not a problem. What Caltrans
14 has told us is that cleaning the lower pipe is a problem
15 because it has debris.

16 It passes water, but it has large debris
17 like mortar and bricks that are difficult to remove.

18 And so their proposal at this point -- and
19 we don't have it written up as a formal proposal -- is to
20 abandon the pipe in place, and it will not -- once
21 abandoned properly, it will not be a source of
22 contaminants to the lake.

23 They have abandoned several pipes as part
24 of the Doyle Drive project, so I would imagine that they
25 would -- when they propose a formal process, they will --

1 they will do something similar to what they've done on
2 the Doyle Drive project.

3 They need to submit that plan to DTSC and
4 DTSC has to approve it. So we're waiting for them to --
5 you know, we're facilitating that, but we're waiting for
6 them to give us that final plan.

7 But I know that their plan is to abandon it
8 in place.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So then they would
10 rehabilitate the other pipe.

11 MS. FANELLI: I --

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Which is just
13 dredging it out, keeping it from flowing properly?

14 MS. FANELLI: The other pipe is open. It
15 flows. It actually has very little sediment in it. But
16 they would clean it to make sure they removed any
17 sediment that was in there.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And then they would
19 maintain that pipe?

20 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. And that pipe would
21 continue to operate to take groundwater from the
22 MacArthur Tunnel that currently discharges to the lake,
23 and it will continue to discharge to the lake.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So the length of
25 the pipe -- maybe this is getting beyond your project,

1 but the length of that pipe isn't needed just to transmit
2 groundwater.

3 In other words, there's no stormwater, so
4 that you could actually take the pipe out, too, right?
5 If you wanted to.

6 MS. FANELLI: That would be a whole
7 different design.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

9 MS. FANELLI: You've be redesigning your
10 stormwater, your groundwater conveyance.

11 Caltrans' not on tap to do that. That's
12 not part of the RAP that was approved.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But they have the
14 option to maintain that in perpetuity just to remove it?

15 MS. FANELLI: I suppose they could.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They could consider
17 it.

18 MS. FANELLI: They could consider it if
19 they chose to.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Thank you.

21 MS. KRAMER: How long is the pipe?

22 MS. FANELLI: I think the pipe is 175, and
23 I forget how long the lower pipe is. The lower pipe
24 extends longer. Maybe around two -- Mark knows. He's
25 obviously read the documents.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. I am
2 familiar with it.

3 MS. CHEEVER: One is going to stay at 75
4 feet?

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: 175. So it's 175
6 feet of pipe conveying thirty gallons of groundwater.

7 MS. CHEEVER: For?

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Freshwater without
9 any stormwater, because it's going to disconnect the
10 storm drains.

11 MS. FANELLI: We're disconnecting the
12 storm drains from the highway. Any other runoff that
13 goes into those pipes would still go into those pipes.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So Pacific Avenue
15 still flows into that pipe?

16 MS. FANELLI: Yes. But there's no traffic
17 on West Pacific. It's a trail. There's no cars, really.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It would increase
19 the amount of water that would go through that pipe,
20 though. Okay.

21 MS. FANELLI: Okay. Other projects that
22 we're working on. Obviously our work on Baker Beach 1A
23 and 2.

24 We have selected contractors for both
25 projects and we're in the process of contracting with

1 them.

2 Assuming that that all goes smoothly, we
3 have a contractor for construction for Baker Beach 1A.
4 We have a separate contractor, ERRG for Baker Beach 2.

5 We are hoping -- we have -- our design
6 documents are nearly complete. We have shared them and
7 are responding to comments from both the Park Service and
8 from DTSC.

9 Obviously we can't finalize those documents
10 and issue them formally until the FS/RAP is signed.

11 So I'm hoping to see that signature page
12 tomorrow. That was the indication as I said earlier that
13 I got from Denise Tsuji, and then we would finalize all
14 of our design documents and then they would be posted.

15 And we are working on a schedule that would
16 have us in construction on Baker Beach 1A by May 13th,
17 which is a Monday. That would be our target start date.

18 Likely Baker Beach 2 would follow as much
19 as a month later. We are currently targeting June 2nd or
20 3rd.

21 I'm not sure what the Monday is. I suppose
22 I could look at my planner. 3rd.

23 MS. MAJHAIL: That's the start of the
24 work?

25 MS. FANELLI: That's the first day out in

1 the field.

2 We are in a position where our contractors
3 can begin to give us their submittals and do basic up-
4 front stuff.

5 But we are a little bit further behind on
6 the design on Baker Beach 2 at this point.

7 So those projects are going very quickly.
8 I think next week, you'll see some signage up at the
9 Baker Beach sites notifying folks of the impending
10 construction and trail closures and providing some
11 information on trail detours and parking detours.

12 We will have project information
13 coordinators like we have at Mountain Lake that will also
14 be helping once the construction actually begins.

15 And I can't give you the estimate from the
16 contractors, but I think -- it's a minimum of three
17 months without any problems, and there's always some
18 issue that comes up.

19 So -- because we have the confirmation
20 samples and all that type of stuff.

21 We are trying to do pre-confirmation
22 samples to the extent we can at Baker Beach 1A, and I
23 believe we did some.

24 We did one round and we have found areas
25 that we need to step out, but just a few areas, and so

1 we're going to be discussing that with the Park Service
2 tomorrow.

3 And then ultimately that information would
4 be shared with the DTSC and try to get their concurrence
5 on that, and that will help us control the time in the
6 field, because at least we'll have some edges defined,
7 and then we'll have to be dealing with the depths that we
8 excavate and taking confirmation samples from depth.

9 And we have not at this point taken any
10 confirmation samples for Baker Beach 2, and I don't
11 believe we're planning on significant, if any, pre-
12 confirmation sampling there.

13 The other project is the Barnard Avenue
14 Protected Range. I understand that that's also sitting
15 on Denise Tsuji's desk waiting for her signature.

16 I think we talked about this last month
17 that she is prioritizing Baker Beach 1A and 2, so that's
18 the reason why we haven't seen a signature on that.

19 We are working on final designs. We were
20 working really with our Natural Resources folks to try to
21 figure out the best configuration and management of water
22 there for their future objectives and goals for that
23 area.

24 I think we've worked that out, so we are
25 now preparing our final design documents.

1 These are more tweaks. They look very
2 similar to what was in the Remedial Action Workplan, but
3 we've made some more detailed decisions about how we're
4 handling water flows and storm flows.

5 Once we get those, we still have to go out
6 to bid. So I don't see that project actually in
7 construction until a little bit later in the summertime.

8 We'll probably use May to procure a
9 contractor for that one. The engineer's estimated time
10 of construction is three weeks. So probably a July
11 construction timeframe.

12 I think that covers all of our large
13 construction projects.

14 The only other site I think that we're
15 actively working on completing the summary RI is fillsite
16 6B, and that's taking longer than I had hoped.

17 We will likely be taking some additional
18 samples in the area around sort of the throw center and
19 that area to fill in some data gaps, and then we will be
20 proposing a no further action based on our data review
21 with the land use control for the majority of that area.

22 So that document you should be seeing
23 probably in the May timeframe, as well, once we get that
24 done and posted, and DTSC will give us guidance on final
25 decision document how that works.

1 Is it a remedial works workplan to the BAPR
2 or how are they going to post-it for public review.

3 And then, you know, the next item is Lobos
4 Creek, and I don't have a presentation to you, but you
5 know we submitted the report. I have Genevieve's copy
6 here in front of me. I think I was actually able to it
7 to you all.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: You did. This is the best
9 map I've seen in a report in a long time. It explained a
10 whole bunch of things.

11 MS. FANELLI: Good.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: I can pass it around. See
13 how it's all connected. You only see it in little
14 pieces. Mountain Lake all the way to the ocean.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Mm-hmm.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: It made a big difference.

17 MS. FANELLI: So Lori Coach is the PM on
18 Lobos Creek and we have not received any comments from
19 her at this point in time.

20 I imagine these -- she is the PM on Baker
21 Beach 2 and Mountain Lake.

22 Although we're busy because we're all the
23 project managers for the same sites here, too, so we put
24 pressure on each other to try to keep moving forward, but
25 if you haven't read it, it's a fairly tight compilation

1 of the history and a lot of data collected for the Lobos
2 Creek area.

3 So the Trust summary RI is that there isn't
4 a -- the conclusion is essentially that there isn't a
5 CERCLA release or source of materials in the creek and
6 it's -- no further action is the request.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: But the lead hits that they
8 found are pretty significant, I thought. The numbers are
9 pretty high.

10 MR. CHESTER: 2,000, 1,900.

11 MS. FANELLI: I don't see that.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Those are the ones that I
13 found. They were old, 1990, but I can't imagine what's
14 still to --

15 MS. CHEEVER: Can we show this to her?

16 MS. MONAGHAN: Sure.

17 MS. FANELLI: So Genevieve was the project
18 manager on this, and I did not ask her to stay tonight.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: That's okay.

20 MS. FANELLI: But if there are specific
21 questions, obviously send them to us, send them to DTSC,
22 to Lori.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

24 MS. FANELLI: I would encourage you.
25 We're pushing Lori to act quickly, so if you have

1 comments or questions, I would get them in to her.

2 MS. MAJHAIL: I can tell her tomorrow
3 morning whatever questions you have. Tell me right now
4 and I will tell her tomorrow morning.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Well, do you have a question
6 or are those lead hits a concern?

7 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Is that your question?

9 MS. MONAGHAN: They're really high.

10 MS. FANELLI: Which lead in particular?
11 In sediment?

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

13 MS. CHEEVER: Ed has it. I don't know if
14 those numbers aren't necessarily tied to the handwritten
15 numbers there, so --

16 MS. CHEEVER: Are they tied together?

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Micrograms versus
19 milligrams.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, maybe.

21 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I -- honestly I'm not
22 seeing it on the summary tables here. I'm not seeing
23 large lead detections --

24 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

25 MS. FANELLI: -- but --

1 MS. MAJHAIL: Can I take those?

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Sure.

3 MS. FANELLI: I'll make copies.

4 MS. MAJHAIL: I'll take it so I can
5 exactly tell her.

6 MS. KRAMER: Take this.

7 MS. FANELLI: We have a color copier.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: I just colored it so I can
9 find Lobos Creek on it from one end to the other.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I haven't had a
11 chance to read it, so I'll read it in the next couple
12 days, too.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Maybe I misread it. I
14 could have. I was looking and going, "Oh."

15 MS. FANELLI: And if it's no further
16 action. If they agree, then we'll respond to any
17 comments.

18 I should get your comments in. We'll
19 finalize the document. If DTSC agrees, then my
20 understanding is it's no further action. There is no
21 other document that is produced.

22 If they disagree, then we'll see what kind
23 of comments they have and what we need to do.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: The samples are old. Older
25 than the RAB program. That's old.

1 MS. FANELLI: There's several -- there's
2 several --

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

4 MS. FANELLI: -- episodes of sampling at
5 Lobos Creek.

6 So if that is the case, then, really the
7 next document you'll see that you haven't seen is -- that
8 would be a decision document or lead to a decision
9 document will be the fillsite 6B, and I'll go back to
10 that for just a second.

11 So we are looking at taking that area and
12 breaking it into two based on future land use, because
13 there's a small sliver of fillsite 6B that overlaps with
14 potential future marsh expansion down in the -- I guess
15 it's called the Quartermaster Reach area.

16 And we would look at that separate from the
17 land use where it's recreational, commercial, industrial,
18 and we may have different land use controls in those two
19 areas.

20 I believe based on the data we have, we
21 feel that under its current condition, the area does not
22 pose any significant risk to eco or human health, and
23 that will likely stay the case in the commercial area
24 where it's developed.

25 So we're addressing in particular the

1 instance where we would construct a marsh in that sliver
2 that is in the -- an area where the future land use could
3 be eco receptors, and likely we would handle that by
4 having a soil management plan, having some prescriptive
5 steps or process that would be part of the land use
6 control that would ensure -- if you follow those
7 processes and plans -- that when a marsh is developed,
8 would not result in an unacceptable ecological exposure
9 or risk in that corner.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
11 questions for Eileen?

12 Okay. I guess we can move on to 5, new
13 business. RAB final report.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: I brought some things from
15 the archives.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Did you?

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Maybe people want to see
18 these old documents or not, but our charter from 1994 and
19 the letter I received from the -- the colonel/commander
20 officer telling me I was on the RAB. That's old.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: April 12th, 1994.

22 MS. CHEEVER: From the first RAB meeting
23 ever.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. But then there's
25 like maps of an early investigation maps and early

1 agendas and telling us what contaminants are on each
2 site, which we know that was only fifty percent correct
3 at best, huh?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: And then this was -- the
6 Technical Review Committee kind of morphed into this, so
7 there's a lot of documentation I have from the old
8 Technical Review Committee.

9 And --

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The Technical
11 Review Committee was '93?

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Is that what it was?

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It was broader than
14 this charter.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: I think so.

16 Anyway, there's a bunch of old yellow paper
17 here that people can look at. Here's the announcement of
18 the RAB in the Star Presidian and the acronyms which we
19 still use.

20 MS. CHEEVER: What year was your letter?

21 MS. MONAGHAN: 1994.

22 MS. CHEEVER: I can't find a date on it.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: (Indicating).

24 MS. CHEEVER: Oh, there you go. Nineteen
25 May 1994.

1 MS. CHEEVER: "The RAB will continue to
2 meet after the base closure. May last approximately two
3 years after the base closure."

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Here's our mission
5 statement. Does anyone know we have one?

6 And I did find some information about --
7 here's like our old agenda, things that we're working on
8 early. We used to do this environmental newsletter. I
9 brought one of those. This is from 1995.

10 MS. CHEEVER: I have a lot of those at
11 home, too.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

13 MS. CHEEVER: A RAB newsletter.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. We did our own
15 newsletter?

16 MS. CHEEVER: It was a Presidio
17 newsletter, but we had a column, and that one may not yet
18 have our column.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: Here's our roster from
20 1997. I have some other ones, but you can see some
21 oldies but goodies that are still on the roster.

22 MS. CHEEVER: James & Morsten?

23 MS. FANELLI: They were bought up. They
24 don't exist anymore. They're part of URS.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Here's July 1994, Fort

1 Mason. Our first meeting was at Fort Mason.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: At the firehouse.

3 MS. CHEEVER: And then the newsletters
4 stopped at one point.

5 MS. FANELLI: They were by the Army. Or
6 they were the Park Service's.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Colonel Gregory.

8 MS. CHEEVER: These continued under the
9 Trust and then for a couple of issues, they were folded
10 into the Trust for the newsletter and then we stopped
11 contributing to it. I can even find the date.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Here's a draft document of
13 guidance for implementing restoration advisory boards,
14 which is what we were looking for at one time, and I went
15 back and looked and there was never any closure
16 guidelines.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: I guess we can write one
19 now, huh? Who everybody is and -- anyway, so that was
20 kind of interesting.

21 I've become a RAB member. And if you have
22 any questions, contact Colonel Janecek.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I vaguely remember
24 him.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: I don't remember him.

1 MS. CHEEVER: You're on this list, Brian.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. I was there in
3 '97.

4 MS. CHEEVER: '97.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: So then the question is:
6 Does anybody want to read any of this or should I kind of
7 do an outline for what's coming out at the bottom here?

8 This is kind of the bottom of the box,
9 so --

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. I think an
11 outline would be great.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm not sure
14 exactly what we are doing with all of it, so --

15 MS. CHEEVER: Well --

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: An outline would
17 start something.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: What I thought I would do
19 is outline all of the documents I find and kind of start
20 a bibliography at some point, right?

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Then people know that I
23 have it. And say I want to write an article about how to
24 figure out what the dictionary of a restoration project
25 is.

1 You know, because we did do a lot of that.
2 We taught people how -- what all the acronyms were and
3 how to figure out what was what.

4 Because it's -- we weren't technical people
5 that we had on the RAB.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: As you're going
7 through these, if something sticks out like a date,
8 charter --

9 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: -- such and such,
11 put the dates down. That would help.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

13 MS. CHEEVER: I have a lot of documents,
14 too, all too many. Maybe I can add some to your list.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: I tried to pitch as many.
16 Maybe I should keep these. The ones in the middle, I
17 don't need them.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Project reports.
19 These are more historical.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, yeah.

21 MS. CHEEVER: You know what's interesting
22 is those of us who joined about only a year later, we
23 were not given all this information or training at all.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: No. It wasn't until later
25 that we kind of got the gumption up to do some training.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We made our own
2 materials.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: We did. And I'm trying to
4 remember Jan's last name.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Baxler.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Thank you. She was one
7 that did a lot of that training.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Because she was at the
9 board, Water Board?

10 MS. CHEEVER: It might say in here.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: She would be on the
12 technical side of the back page.

13 MS. CHEEVER: No, but she became a
14 community member.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: She wasn't a community
16 member. She was an agency member. She went to work for
17 the EPA later.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

19 MS. CHEEVER: But she was the chair at one
20 point.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: Was she? I don't remember
22 that. I remember Roberta Blank. She's not around
23 anymore, is she?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: She's EPA now.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: She was like
2 community co-chair before me, wasn't she?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. Jan?

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Jan Baxter?

5 MS. CHEEVER: She was. I think she went
6 from maybe being technical member to being a community
7 member.

8 Does everybody like the idea that --

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: She left when the
10 Trust came in.

11 MS. CHEEVER: -- Mark had with some kind
12 of outline, type of outline that we would cover specific
13 topics?

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We kind of started
15 that last week. We threw out a bunch of potential
16 topics, costs, blah-blah-blah.

17 It's hard to kind of grasp all that and put
18 that into a document, though. That's the problem that I
19 was kind of having with that.

20 I actually thought that we would have to
21 just start writing something to kind of figure out what
22 to do with it.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you come up with
25 an outline that made sense. I'm not quite sure if we

1 want two pieces of forty pages. You know,

2 MS. CHEEVER: In the whole thing?

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The whole thing.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: I can probably write forty
5 and pair it down to two.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you have forty
7 pages, you can do Nike and you can do all this stuff, but
8 it's kind of a lot of work.

9 If it's just five pages, you just kind of
10 pull out the most important thing and say what was
11 important about Nike, what was important about this.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Like one of the first
13 projects -- I have a documentation -- was the fuel
14 distribution removal because I was on the committee. I
15 was on that with Harold Ball from Stanford.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Brilliant guy. Anyway, I
18 have a lot of that documentation still. That was my
19 first project.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So what was
21 important about that enough to tell people now?

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Well, the trivia from that
23 was amazing, how many tanks there were and how much
24 disturbed piping and where the storage tank was and it
25 was a gravity feed and all that stuff was -- I thought it

1 was really interesting.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It was one of those
3 projects that started out fairly small and was confined
4 by the Army, and then as they started doing it, it just
5 grew and grew and grew and became this big project.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: It did.

7 MS. GEE: Do you think it might be helpful
8 just to do like a -- a sort of an extended chart and so
9 that you could have somebody's memorable projects and
10 then you would have just say, oh, this was the original
11 description of the project, but then what were the new
12 surprises.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

14 MS. GEE: And you could do it that way,
15 and I think it would be much more amenable to general
16 reading.

17 They want to highlight, oh, this was what
18 was discovered in this one and what was some of the
19 surprises, whether they're, you know, positive or
20 negative and then a cost sheet, things like that.

21 And it would be just a chart that one can
22 just look at and say oh -- if they're interested in
23 Mountain Lake, they can look at that one and then go down
24 and sort of get like an out -- you know, bullet points.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Right.

1 MS. GEE: Rather than a text, because a
2 text would be very time consuming, but if you could just
3 do a template and then fill in what are some of the --

4 MS. CHEEVER: Are these like RAB derived
5 actions? If there's something that the RAB specifically
6 did that caused the course of the -- you know, those
7 would be like the big milestones.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Big milestones,
9 yeah. Pulling those big milestones out.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: Well, it seems like the --
11 I have the original list of what they thought were all
12 the sites on the Presidio, and so -- and what the
13 contaminants were.

14 So now we can go back and say, "Well, this
15 was what we were told in 1994 and this is what we found
16 when we investigated it. Now it's cleared." You know
17 it's capped. Now it's gone, one of those things.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Sure.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Eileen, this RAB report
20 would go into part of a larger closure report; right?

21 MS. FANELLI: Well, that's -- I think it
22 could.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Oh.

24 MS. FANELLI: What I need to do at the end
25 of the program to document compliance with the consent

1 agreement is prepare a little summary report that says:
2 "Here's all the sites that were listed in the consent
3 agreement. Here's everything that we did and we
4 complied," and one of the elements that we did is we had
5 a RAB. We would have public outreach.

6 I know Brian was talking a little bit about
7 the nuances and the differences in the Presidio MOA, the
8 last time we had with the Army agreement versus what's in
9 the consent agreement.

10 I have not outlined that final report
11 myself, but I will go through details of each of the
12 sites, and give a little bit of history about how it may
13 have evolved with the focus on documenting we went
14 through the CERCLA process to confirm that there wasn't
15 any remaining eco or human health.

16 I would think it would be -- and I can
17 write that yes, we did have a public outreach and this is
18 what it looked like.

19 You know, we had all these kinds of public
20 outreach documents, and then we had the RAB and we also
21 went to other neighborhood groups and documented that,
22 and I just that it it would be interesting, and I can do
23 that bare bones, but I thought it would be interesting if
24 you guys told your own story -- and I think it would be
25 interesting for you to start at eye level and kind of

1 start writing up the narrative of how we began.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

3 MS. FANELLI: And the things that you did
4 take the lead on, training others, I think is more
5 important for you to document than whether or not through
6 the work of the Army or through the work of the Trust or
7 whatever, additional contaminants were found.

8 I think it's more important that you as a
9 community, you talk about what you guys did with that
10 information.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Right.

12 MS. FANELLI: How you responded to that
13 information or how you encouraged collection of that
14 information and that you document that.

15 Because, you know, you are the, probably in
16 the country, the longest standing RAB, and it's twenty
17 years, and the more you kind of document that --

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Longest sitting
19 RAB. It would be very interesting to have your all take
20 on that.

21 MS. CHEEVER: This sort of answers the
22 question you asked. Are these RAB derived actions? We
23 then don't need to document all of the cleanup.

24 MS. FANELLI: Oh, absolutely not.
25 Absolutely not.

1 MS. CHEEVER: But another point that could
2 be made is the RAB's participation predated the Trust.

3 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

4 MS. CHEEVER: And you're going to document
5 the consent agreement moving forward.

6 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

7 MS. CHEEVER: But actually some of the
8 very significant things the RAB did.

9 MS. FANELLI: Early on.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Maybe we need the Army
11 feeling the need to pass the baton to the Trust.

12 But at any rate, that definitely is a very
13 important part of the RAB story.

14 MS. FANELLI: I think it is.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Maybe we realize the reader
16 wouldn't have all the background or something, maybe the
17 agreement.

18 MS. FANELLI: I think documenting how you
19 came about, your size, how you solicited additional RAB
20 members, how you trained RAB members, how you -- how you
21 wrote your mission statements and came up with your
22 bylaws and how you came up with your -- your statements
23 of what -- priorities in terms of removals and what not.
24 That's the story that's interesting for you all to tell.

25 MS. MAJHAIL: How the decisions were made

1 in the RAB.

2 MS. FANELLI: Yes. You know, and I'm
3 thinking of your document as being somewhat stand-alone,
4 and certainly I would reference it and incorporate it to
5 the extent it made sense and was -- and was appropriate,
6 but I -- I would think you'd want your own stand-alone
7 document.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So when I was
10 thinking about, you know, just how much detail we want to
11 put in there, then I kind of ran up against the problem
12 of fact checking.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you're talking
15 about something in 1997, how do you check all of those
16 facts that you want -- if you want a detail in there,
17 then you have to --

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Last man standing gets to
19 tell the story.

20 MS. FANELLI: That's right.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Maybe you don't
22 want to go that deep and try to find all those details
23 and somehow make it -- just pull out the bigger issue and
24 the point without having to say that this many and on
25 this date, so and so.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Right.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mark, it may not be that
3 hard.

4 MS. CHEEVER: We might have the documents
5 to show a lot of that.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the Army would
7 have had the government records, and those I would
8 imagine transferred to the Trust library.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm sure they are.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Like minutes of meetings.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Those were official
12 government records. They have to have gone somewhere.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's just a lot
14 of --

15 MS. FANELLI: Maybe start with the high-
16 level story, and then as you began to just document it,
17 the areas of interest will reveal themselves.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Well, the RAB garnered so
19 much interest in the Bay Area community only because of
20 the Trust and the fact that it was a new national park,
21 and I mean that's how we got hundreds of applications for
22 our membership drives and things, how we winnowed them
23 out, because it was a lot of work to do that, but we had
24 five membership drives over twenty years or something.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: You know, Doug Kern

1 volunteered to help write that.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: Did he? Good.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I was trying to
4 encourage him to start off with '94, '95 years, the early
5 days that you have here.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Try to put that
8 into -- put that into words.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: If you start off with a
10 timeline bibliography or list of documents that I have,
11 I'll send those to him.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: You and Doug could
13 actually start off '94-'95, the beginning.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Old days.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: Well -- I know.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Pre -- pre-modern
18 RAB or whatever we're going to call it.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Technical Review
20 Committee.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Exactly.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: We were on our way.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Exactly. By '97,
24 we were all up and running.

25 MS. CHEEVER: '95.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We started off. By
2 '97, I think we were really engaged.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. Definitely.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: From '94 to '97 is
5 kind of a good period to start off. If you start writing
6 that --

7 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah, okay.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: -- and get the rest
9 of us going. That would be great.

10 We kind of got bogged down on Doug. How do
11 you collaboratively write something like that? Can you
12 go on Google docs and -- so you can share writing this
13 somehow?

14 Doug said he had done that before. But
15 then may have to set that up to do that.

16 MS. KRAMER: It sounds like you could just
17 e-mail it back and forth.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: E-mail a Word
19 document back and forth.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: If you keep track of a Word
21 document.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It might be easier.
23 That can also be converted to a Google doc later if you
24 want to try to do that.

25 MR. HULTGREN: I would think somebody has

1 to come up with the first draft. I think you need an
2 outline of topics first, and that's what somebody was
3 asking you about.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

5 MR. HULTGREN: You know, time topics,
6 timeline topics, and then you almost need an individual
7 who has direct experience to write something first.

8 Then you can send it to Doug or somebody
9 else who is knowledgeable and make it if this doesn't
10 work or whatever, you know.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So I was kind of
12 thinking instead of doing '94 to 2013, if you could do
13 '94 to '97, like you said the outline, and then write up
14 just that.

15 Since Doug was actually there, he has
16 firsthand experience.

17 MR. HULTGREN: As it developed.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And then work from
19 there.

20 MR. HULTGREN: As it develops, too, I
21 think you'll learn pretty quickly the format for it.
22 Whether you have separate chapters on each happening or
23 just how it should be done, narrative or outline or what.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We can nominate
25 Doug to do it.

1 MR. BUDROE: By acclamation.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. Okay.

3 MS. FANELLI: Can I suggest you need a
4 project -- this is a project. Writing up your share is a
5 project.

6 Your final deliverable is a report, and so
7 you need a project manager. You need one person on the
8 RAB that is going to manage the process and identify
9 steps that you need to go through.

10 Just like you've been sort of talking about
11 an outline or data collection is one process, an outline
12 is another process and then writing the different
13 sections are additional processes.

14 So I might -- I'm not sure that's a hot
15 potato, and that's the underlying discussion here. Who
16 wants to be the project manager for the RAB, but I
17 would -- whether it's Doug or it's Mark or --

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I don't know.

19 MS. FANELLI: -- Jan, whoever, Julie,
20 whoever takes on that PM task.

21 And then they can -- I agree with Julie.
22 If you want to try to really just based on my experience
23 get something going, then one person takes that first
24 cut.

25 MR. HULTGREN: Yes.

1 MS. FANELLI: -- and then gets some
2 information.

3 MR. HULTGREN: I think at least as far as
4 the first -- the outline, let's say, or whatever we want
5 to do, it should be someone -- since we have a few,
6 someone who was there at the outset.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: That's me.

8 MR. HULTGREN: Doug and Mark, I think. I
9 don't know if others --

10 MS. MONAGHAN: She came a year later.

11 MR. HULTGREN: You're close enough.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Would there be any
13 benefit --

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Julie and I came
15 together, I believe.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Would there be any benefit
17 to having a committee meeting?

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Let me take a shot of at
19 least putting it together. I have a box of stuff in my
20 living room.

21 I'll make a list. So then that might -- as
22 I go through and document it, as I type it up, I'll see
23 if I can put it in order of some sort, either by topic or
24 by date.

25 MS. CHEEVER: Thank you.

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If it gets too
3 overwhelming --

4 MS. MONAGHAN: I'll farm it out.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: -- try -- just the
6 first years.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah, yeah, yeah. You
8 know, there's -- this is the bulk of what I have from '94
9 to '97, so it's not that hard.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Just a question of
11 time.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And you want to
14 talk to Doug about coordinating this?

15 MS. MONAGHAN: I'll just send him a note
16 when I have the list here and say I'm going to start
17 making a list of all the documents I have in my box and
18 see what happens.

19 MS. CHEEVER: What do we think is the
20 deadline for the project?

21 MS. MAJHAIL: Good question.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I would say April
23 12th, 2014.

24 MS. CHEEVER: All right.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: A twenty-year

1 silver anniversary.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Sounds good.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
4 thoughts on the final project? Final report. Final
5 report.

6 Okay.

7 MS. CHEEVER: To clarify, you still like
8 the idea of highlights, but also maybe, depending on what
9 comes out of these outlines, big topics, certain topics
10 or what?

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Originally my idea
12 was you write up the history, and then as you do a
13 narrative of the history, you reach certain milestones
14 and then those would be like a case history with more
15 detail.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Nike missile base.
18 We did this to the Nike missile base and there would be
19 something that explains it.

20 I'm a little apprehensive about how much
21 research and work that would take, whether we'd actually
22 do that.

23 So then my fallback position, if it's just
24 a narrative highlighting the milestones and what we think
25 we contributed in a shorter document, we could do that

1 with not too much -- but, you know, whatever we can rally
2 and muster energy to do.

3 So if we start with a narrative that just
4 highlights accomplishments and milestones and expand on
5 that as we are capable of doing, I guess that -- what do
6 you think, Julie?

7 MS. CHEEVER: That sounds good.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Public
11 comments? We'll skip over that one.

12 Action items and agenda items. Let's see
13 here. Next month, May, that's our quarterly report.

14 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I may do both
16 project updates and financial?

17 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. We'll do the full
18 quarterly report.

19 I'll look in to see -- since we're getting
20 into the longer days and we should have construction
21 going and the dredging operating, maybe we can see about
22 scheduling a -- part of the RAB meeting would be a visit
23 to see the operation and get it explained.

24 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's a good idea.

1 MS. FANELLI: Because I think it's going
2 to be very interesting, fairly unique. So I'll try to
3 find -- offer a few days that we might be able to do it.

4 It could be in lieu of a lab meeting, early
5 RAB meeting. It may be worthwhile for those of you that
6 still go to an office job to maybe escape at the end of
7 the day, if they're not going to be operating, but to
8 just actually see something in operation.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So that would be
10 next month?

11 MS. FANELLI: We'll see. We'll do the
12 quarterly report. I'll see if we can schedule that.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It could be on the
14 same day. That's worked out well in the past.

15 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's still light at
17 7:00, but at 6:00, we did them at 6:00, didn't we?

18 MS. FANELLI: I'll see.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Before the meeting.

20 MS. KRAMER: How long generally will it on
21 again?

22 MS. FANELLI: It's in two phases. Each
23 phase is estimated to take twenty to 25 days to fill the
24 bags and then there will be a down period where the bags
25 are doing a little drying, and then they'll be breaking

1 them up and hauling that material away, relaying new bags
2 and then the process will start again.

3 MS. CHEEVER: Bags.

4 MS. FANELLI: Bags.

5 MS. KRAMER: Like two and a half to three
6 months process?

7 MS. FANELLI: It is more like a three to
8 four.

9 MS. KRAMER: Mm-hmm.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Maybe we should
11 shoot for like 6:30.

12 Is that going to work out? Mountain Lake?
13 Before the next RAB meeting.

14 MS. FANELLI: Right, but I don't want to
15 go unless there's something, you know, interesting to
16 see, yeah. So let me check.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Suggesting maybe -- I don't
18 know when they stop work, but is there --

19 MS. FANELLI: They're working longer days.
20 So let me ask -- you know, I'm truthfully a little bit
21 removed from the day-to-day operations.

22 Let me get with Genevieve, see where we are
23 and a week before the RAB meeting, we can communicate
24 with you and see what might be the best time to suggest.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So they open the

1 trail up at night, right, West Pacific Avenue?

2 MS. FANELLI: It is, I believe, open at
3 night, yeah.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Maybe we could walk
5 in.

6 MS. FANELLI: You can always walk in.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If you haven't seen
8 it at all, it's interesting just to see the treatment
9 pad, the big pipe.

10 MS. FANELLI: But I like to have the
11 contractor available to explain the operation to you as
12 opposed to just looking at a bunch of equipment sitting
13 there.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We can do that.

15 MS. FANELLI: I think that will be more
16 interesting.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Is that
18 enough? I guess that's if you have.

19 Action items. Jan?

20 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm up.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Anything
22 further, comments?

23 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

24 (The meeting concluded at 8:15 PM).

25 ---o0o---

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2013

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Mark Youngkin, Facilitator

Eileen Fanelli

4 Brian Ullensvang

Terri Thomas

5 Genevieve Coyle

Julie Cheever

6 Gloria Gee

John Budroe

7 Sam Berman

John Chester

8 Jan Blum

9 Also Present

10 Rick Teczun

11 ---o0o---

12

13

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

16 of the Meeting, and on May 14, 2013, 7:09 PM at Building

17 67, Presidio of San Francisco, California, before me,

18 MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of California,

19 there commenced a RAB meeting under the provisions of the

20 Presidio Trust.

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements:	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations:	
7	A. Quarterly Report - Eileen Fanelli	4
8	B. Mountain Lake North Arm Sediment Sampling	49
9	5) New Business - None	
10	6) Public Comment - None	
11	7) Action Items and Agenda Items:	84
12	8) Closing:	85
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the
2 regularly monthly scheduled meeting of the Restoration
3 Advisory Board for the Presidio of San Francisco, May
4 14th, 2013.

5 My name's Mark Youngkin, community co-
6 chair/acting facilitator, I guess, as our facilitator,
7 Doug Kern is busy, living in Dana Point.

8 Does everyone have an agenda? Any
9 additions, discussions, modifications? Seeing none,
10 announcements.

11 Any announcements, Jan?

12 Topic number 4, discussions and
13 presentations, quarterly report, Eileen Fanelli, Presidio
14 Trust.

15 MS. FANELLI: Okay. I actually printed
16 the quarterly report today instead of putting it on the
17 projector, because I don't have any photos, but that was
18 because you just got an eyeful being out at Mountain
19 Lake.

20 So agenda follows as usual. I'll give you
21 our milestones, look at some of the costs, talk about
22 schedule and our program overview.

23 So last quarter was another big quarter for
24 us. The public review period for the Final Draft FS/RAPs
25 for Baker Beach 1A and 2 closed. We also completed the

1 Final Remedial Action Workplan and comment response
2 document for BAPR.

3 And the Mountain Lake RDIP was approved by
4 DTSC.

5 In petroleum, we also had some significant
6 milestones. Water Board is very close to being complete
7 with many of the buildings, but we still had some
8 outstanding closures and we received closure for 1349.

9 Our priority eight tanks were submitted in
10 three packages. We got closure on two of those packages.
11 Tank 1802.5, which was an unknown tank, had been closed
12 by the county.

13 It was a non-leaker, but they had sent it
14 off to Water Board and Water Board reviewed the package
15 and closed it, as well.

16 The county sent it off because of PAH
17 detection in the tank backfill, and then on lead-based
18 paint, we continued to make progress and submitted
19 several no further action letters, and actually this
20 quarter received a few back from DTSC.

21 So the budget summary is showing on the
22 next page. It was slightly different from what we've
23 done in other quarters, but it still gives you the same
24 basic picture.

25 We are still estimating 172 million at

1 program completion. Remaining to complete is about 31
2 million, and that is primarily in the area of CERCLA and
3 that's primarily Mountain Lake, Baker Beach 1A, Baker
4 Beach 2 and Barnard Avenue Protected Range and lead-based
5 paints.

6 But we're continuing to work through it,
7 and we've been -- obviously you can see the accounting
8 reimbursed costs. We have been getting reimbursed from
9 Zurich on a monthly basis.

10 Not surprisingly, the top six projects with
11 the greatest period of activity; i.e. where we spent the
12 most money, are the projects that we're currently working
13 on, Baker Beach 2, Barnard Avenue Firing Range, Mountain
14 Lake.

15 Lead-based paint and Letterman, if you've
16 looked on O'Reilly Street, the houses, we've been out
17 there for several months doing extensive lead-based paint
18 soil cleanups, and that's where that money has been
19 spent.

20 Building 207-231, we completed that
21 project, and we also did install some groundwater
22 monitoring wells that quarter, and we worked on plans for
23 doing soil gas in building 228 as part of the -- which
24 was a cap requirement.

25 And DTSC oversight. All this work can't

1 happen without DTSC oversight, and so their bill came in,
2 as well, at a little over a hundred thousand dollars.

3 MS. BLUM: Do you foresee an end to the
4 lead-based paint repairs or is that just going to go on
5 and on and on and on?

6 MS. FANELLI: Lead-based paint soil?

7 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

8 MS. FANELLI: I do see an end to it. We
9 actually only have about 250 structures left to address.
10 I'd say half of those structures are oddballs.

11 They're concrete buildings. They're buried
12 bunkers. They're things that may not actually -- they're
13 demolished buildings. They're things we're working with
14 DTSC kind of on a one off basis to close.

15 The rest of them are scheduled and
16 calendared for work and there's a small, small handful of
17 buildings that are not stabilized that we may not do
18 within the policy period, and so they would become a
19 Trust future liability.

20 MS. BLUM: Are these located in one
21 general district or are they all --

22 MS. FANELLI: They're all non -- they're
23 all commercial buildings, non-residential buildings.

24 So we prioritized the residential
25 buildings, and they're essentially all done. So these

1 are more commercial buildings that are located -- like
2 the Mason Street warehouses, I think maybe some of them,
3 buildings where there is an opportunity for that lead-
4 based paint soil to happen as part of the development
5 proposal with a render or lessee or a tenant --

6 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

7 MS. FANELLI: -- and we did that
8 strategically.

9 MR. BERMAN: I asked a question about the
10 DTSC payment. Is the cumulative to date the total from
11 the inception of the project?

12 MS. FANELLI: Yes, it is.

13 MR. BERMAN: So if you look at the total
14 number of person hours, is that available so you can
15 figure out what you're paying per person hour?

16 MS. FANELLI: Yes, I can. Actually, we
17 get it that way. We get an invoice that details all of
18 the individual DTSC staff that had worked on a project.

19 MR. BERMAN: Right, but there's various --
20 they're not all paid the same, right?

21 MS. FANELLI: No, they were not.

22 MR. BERMAN: I was just looking for a
23 number -- a ballpark number as to what's the average per
24 hour cost of a DTSC person.

25 MS. FANELLI: I don't have a copy of their

1 notice right here in front of me, but it does range, and
2 I get it broken out, you know, a billing rate and then
3 there's some overhead applied to it.

4 So I'm not sure how -- I'd have to do some
5 calculations to get it to you for an hourly rate.

6 MR. BERMAN: I was just trying to get an
7 idea of -- that number includes the DTSC overhead and
8 benefits, as well?

9 MS. FANELLI: It includes on overhead
10 number, but I'm not sure how they calculate the overhead
11 number, but I would assume it has a certain amount of
12 indirect costs, what I call indirect costs like vacation
13 times.

14 MR. BERMAN: That's all -- that's all part
15 of the package, right? But if we knew how many hours
16 there were, then I could figure out what's it costing the
17 Trust per hour, including overhead and everything else
18 for a DTSC person.

19 MS. FANELLI: Well, usually that -- I can
20 tell you that that -- we get it -- I could probably
21 figure that out, because the invoices come in with the
22 number of hours that each person is charging.

23 So depending on the individual invoice, I
24 can calculate how many FTEs the invoice is for. Is it
25 for 2.3 FTEs? Is it 1.5? And I can calculate an average

1 number for the invoice for that period.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I think for private
3 jobs, like last I say, was something like 140 an hour.

4 MS. FANELLI: It ranges -- I want to say
5 it ranges from anywhere to eighty to 120 we see. But
6 that's kind of a guess.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's a substantial
8 amount per hour.

9 MS. FANELLI: It's substantial.

10 MR. BERMAN: Because of the indirect cost,
11 right?

12 MS. FANELLI: Well, I'm not sure the
13 indirect costs are that high on the actual salary.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They're just
15 charging you market rates as a professional -- usually
16 they're geologists or something, they're engineers.

17 MR. BERMAN: Of course I don't know what
18 their indirect charges are, but a private company's
19 indirect charges can be more than a hundred percent
20 easily.

21 MS. FANELLI: Their markups are not more
22 than a hundred percent of what they charge me, so -- on
23 their invoice. I'm not sure what's in it, but I can next
24 time let you know what the hourly charges are.

25 I'm not sure it's inclusive of the

1 overhead. I'm not sure how they calculate.

2 MR. BERMAN: That's the only number that's
3 meaningful, three 3,200,000 spent, and that's a total X
4 number of person hours.

5 So you divide -- if you know -- it's
6 just -- it's sort of a -- a ballpark figure that tells
7 you what you're paying for the DTSC services.

8 MS. FANELLI: I can get you that.

9 MS. CHEEVER: But what could be done about
10 it one way or the other?

11 MR. BERMAN: I'm not saying that --
12 there's nothing that we can do about anything here as far
13 as the RAB goes, but it's just that you're stuck with
14 DTSC.

15 You have to do it, and I'm just trying to,
16 you know, figure out, you know, what is the penalty here?
17 How much are you paying? Do you end up paying something
18 like 150 to \$200 an hour? I don't know.

19 Certainly if you went to a private firm, a
20 private firm doing geologic evaluation with overhead, it
21 would be close to 200 easily, or even more.

22 MS. FANELLI: The question is: What do
23 you get for that money? How efficient is the agency?

24 MR. BERMAN: You're the one that
25 pronounces on that.

1 MS. FANELLI: That's right. DTSC has been
2 working with us -- obviously all the progress that I've
3 been able to report on in the last couple years is and
4 what we've gotten done is because we're getting a lot of
5 attention from DTSC and support.

6 MR. BERMAN: Did you have any interaction
7 with this deputy director that resigned as a result of
8 conflicts of interest?

9 MS. FANELLI: I don't know that person's
10 name. I don't think so, but I don't know --

11 MS. BLUM: At DTSC?

12 MR. BERMAN: Yes. Second in command of
13 DTSC was investigated for improper -- I don't know --
14 business arrangements because she had large amounts of
15 stock -- not small amounts. Large amounts of stock in
16 companies that DTSC was supposedly regulating, and
17 somebody started a probe into this and finally they found
18 out that this was in indeed the case, and when confronted
19 with this, she offered to retire quickly.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Sign of the times,
21 yeah.

22 Okay. Can we move along?

23 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

24 MR. BERMAN: I guess that's new business,
25 right? Sorry. Out of order.

1 MS. FANELLI: The next slide is really
2 just the average standard project budget evaluation, and
3 it tells you based on our current estimate at completion
4 and the moneys from the Army and the interest received
5 and the claims received and additional funding that the
6 Trust has invested that's not recovered, where the
7 program is at.

8 And so we are looking at that thirty
9 million or so to complete, and of that, of course, we're
10 assuming that the majority of that is covered either
11 under the RSL or the REEL policies, provided to get the
12 work done within the policy period.

13 MR. BERMAN: So do you think very little
14 of that money will have to come out of the general pocket
15 of the Presidio?

16 MS. FANELLI: That is the goal.

17 MR. BERMAN: Very admirable.

18 MS. FANELLI: That is my mission.

19 MR. BERMAN: Does that include the yacht
20 that you're getting?

21 MS. FANELLI: I wish. Actually, I don't
22 like sailing. If they offer me a yacht, that's not a big
23 carrot for me.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There's no stock.

25 MS. FANELLI: Okay. So financially, we're

1 plugging away. Obviously because we are operating under
2 a reimbursement scenario, our finances are constantly
3 scrutinized, and so we are always working to document
4 that we are appropriately spending dollars on
5 remediation.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The accounting
7 system is working pretty good, cost and accounting?

8 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's good to see.

10 MS. BLUM: Boy, I'll say.

11 MR. BERMAN: And actually, in hindsight,
12 it appears that the insurance policies were well worth
13 their premiums.

14 MS. FANELLI: I would say so.

15 MS. BLUM: I'll say.

16 MS. FANELLI: We've recovered more than we
17 have -- we spent on the policies.

18 MS. BLUM: Is Zurich becoming or are your
19 insurers becoming more difficult in negotiations? Do you
20 sense any change in fluidity?

21 MS. FANELLI: No. Not at this point,
22 actually. We did have some rough bumps, and obviously we
23 went to court with Zurich under the Mountain Lake case
24 and we've gone through some additional discussions, legal
25 discussions on payment provisions, how they're going to

1 make payment, and we've come to some agreements, and at
2 this point, things are fairly smooth.

3 I think they're hoping we just get to the
4 end.

5 MS. BLUM: Yes.

6 MS. FANELLI: Go away.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We picked an
8 insurance company that's solvent and solid, right?

9 MS. FANELLI: That's right. We're not
10 worried about that. At least I don't think we are.

11 MR. BERMAN: One of the -- the executive
12 directors before Craig, do you remember his name?

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Jim.

14 MS. BLUM: Meadows.

15 MR. BERMAN: There was a lot of criticism
16 in his last days for the exorbitant amount that he had
17 agreed to -- for the insurance policy.

18 I don't know if anyone's ever in touch with
19 him, but, you know, he -- I suppose you remember this.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't remember.

21 MS. CHEEVER: I was around then, and I
22 don't remember that criticism, but you might have heard.

23 MR. BERMAN: I certainly remember it.

24 MS. BLUM: I think that I remembered
25 thinking that the hundred million or the commented

1 feeling was the hundred million was totally inadequate.
2 That's what I remember.

3 MR. BERMAN: Yes, but --

4 MS. BLUM: But --

5 MR. BERMAN: But you weren't here when
6 Meadows was the executive director.

7 MS. BLUM: But I remember when he left in
8 the middle of the night under a small cloud.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Scheduling.

10 MS. FANELLI: Scheduling status. On the
11 RAB 4 sites, landfills 10 and 8 in particular, we are
12 still working on our groundwater analysis. The site work
13 is done. The sites appear to be doing very well.

14 We had a site certification pending with
15 DTSC and I think part of it is land use controls with
16 Park Service, and I know Park Service is working with
17 DTSC on that, too.

18 And the -- I'm hoping to get the
19 groundwater analysis out in the next month. It's been
20 doing and there's a little bit of bottleneck in my inbox.
21 That's why this one hasn't gone forward.

22 Fillsite 1, landfill 2, that site has been
23 certified. We requested to cease groundwater monitoring.
24 Medi gave us a couple of comments, asked us to take one
25 additional round.

1 I said March. I'm not sure if that's
2 right. I said March. We don't anticipate it to be any
3 different. We'll see. We'll supply that information to
4 DTSC.

5 On landfill E, that site is also certified.
6 We are in the post-closure of landfill gas and
7 groundwater monitoring phase, and that is ongoing.

8 MR. BERMAN: Did it turn out there was
9 much gas?

10 MS. FANELLI: No gas. We haven't measured
11 any measurable gas, I don't believe, in any of the vents.

12 And so a few weeks ago, a few months ago,
13 we requested to shut down a certain number of vents and
14 monitor just the higher elevation vents, and DTSC
15 approved that.

16 So now we're monitoring the higher
17 elevation vents, and we'll see if there's no gas detected
18 there, then we may ask for permission to shut down the
19 monitoring of the gas completely.

20 MR. BERMAN: Was it originally -- was
21 there some gas detected?

22 MS. FANELLI: There was some methane
23 detected, yes, in one.

24 MS. BLUM: If that happens, are -- I think
25 you have some above-ground vents.

1 Would the vents come out?

2 MS. FANELLI: Ultimately the vents would
3 come out, and probably they would come out once we have
4 approval to completely abandon the system.

5 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

6 MS. FANELLI: They may stay -- they may be
7 cut down below the ground surface or they may be
8 preserved in case there was an issue in the future that
9 we needed access.

10 I would imagine they may stay pretty much
11 the way they are until the land is redeveloped as a ball
12 field, and when there's future construction out there,
13 maybe do it all at the same time.

14 Mountain Lake, you just saw where we are,
15 so we're dredging. Last quarter, we got the final RDIP,
16 as I said, approved and now we're kind of hopping into
17 real production mode on the sediments.

18 Baker Beach 1A. The Final FS/RAPs have
19 been issued, and last week, the final RDIPs were approved
20 by DTSC.

21 We have our contractor selected forth.
22 We've given them a notice to proceed. They are doing
23 their submittals and we're anticipating doing field
24 mobilization first week in June at Baker Beach 1A.

25 MR. BUDROE: I haven't seen an e-mail

1 notice on that yet.

2 Is that on Envirostor or is that available
3 through the Trust website?

4 MS. FANELLI: The RDIP?

5 MR. BUDROE: The Final FS/RAP.

6 MS. FANELLI: Final FS/RAP is available on
7 our website. I'm pretty sure, Genevieve.

8 MS. COYLE: It's on SharePoint.

9 MS. FANELLI: It's in DTSC's court to mail
10 that, and I think there's a misunderstanding between
11 Radhika and Lori about getting -- or Bob about getting
12 that out.

13 So I'm not sure where they are in terms of
14 mailing it, but it has been finalized. I know it is on
15 our SharePoint.

16 Do we post it on to our remember web page?

17 MS. COYLE: It's not on the public site,
18 but it needs to be ADA version. I haven't gotten that
19 yet. By law, the ones on the public website, something
20 we do to the PDF.

21 MR. BUDROE: Little screen reader?

22 MS. COYLE: It takes longer to get that
23 screen generated. But the SharePoint copy's up, in which
24 you all have that.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Are you looking for

1 the responsiveness summary?

2 MR. BUDROE: Yeah.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Do you have that?

4 MS. FANELLI: Oh, definitely.

5 MS. COYLE: DTSC should be sending all of
6 you your own responsiveness summary.

7 MS. FANELLI: That might be where Lori
8 might be working on it.

9 MS. COYLE: They haven't taken care of it
10 yet. That gets issued by DTSC.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

12 MS. FANELLI: So Baker Beach 2, the Final
13 FS/RAP is also issued. In that case, the RDIP is still
14 in the works, but we're hoping to get it to DTSC next
15 week.

16 Assuming that we can get approval, we have
17 already selected a contractor for that site. The
18 contractor's ERRG. They will of course have some
19 submittals, as well, but we're hoping that they would get
20 started the second or third week in June.

21 We do have -- if you're out that way, we do
22 have some PICs that have started this week. You might
23 run into a few of them that are providing users in the
24 public about that work that's come up.

25 MR. CHESTER: Public information.

1 MS. FANELLI: On Fillsite 6B, it's a
2 little bit behind schedule on that. We have been working
3 in response to comments from Lori about how to package
4 our data for that site relative to future land use.

5 So if you remember, that had lots of little
6 sub areas. So we've actually reorganized that so that we
7 have two major areas.

8 That area that will of course future native
9 habitats, the Quartermaster Reach area and the portion
10 that will become or stay what it is now, which is
11 primarily the commercial recreational area.

12 In doing that, we need some more samples,
13 and those samples are not from the native habitat area,
14 but from the Letterman larger area.

15 So I believe those samples were collected
16 last week or this week or will be collected next week.
17 It's right around that time. I know it was approved to
18 go out and grab those samples, and once we get that, we
19 will be doing our revised RI report that separates those
20 sites.

21 That said, there was a sub area, fillsite
22 6B, which is that little area next to the fire station,
23 and DTSC has issued a no further action for that small
24 sub area based on data collected to date.

25 So that area has come out of the -- it's

1 not part of the site anymore.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The FS 6 -- which
3 one are you talking about now?

4 MS. FANELLI: Fillsite 6B. So 6B was a
5 small area, and here's the small map. It is I believe --
6 6B -- 6A is right here, right? It's this little area
7 right here.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There's five more
9 disturbed areas.

10 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. There were -- I think
11 there were originally like ten sub areas.

12 MS. COYLE: Ten total.

13 MS. FANELLI: Ten total. Two were not in
14 areas of building debris, so they are no longer part of
15 it.

16 The other areas stand except for this one
17 that's just now removed from the fillsite, and then the
18 others are all consolidated into now the area that will
19 be a future Quartermaster Reach or natural habitat,
20 restoration and the rest will stay recreation.

21 So I'm hoping that we'll get a report on
22 that next month.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Is the old fill in
24 there, too?

25 MS. FANELLI: No -- well, old fill

1 underlies it, but this is just about 6B, the material on
2 done.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Old fill, is that a
4 separate --

5 MS. FANELLI: Old fill is a separate site,
6 if you will, to the extent it is a site. DTSC has asked
7 us to evaluate old fill where it occurs in areas where
8 the future land use is eventual restoration of a natural
9 habitat, native habitat, and we are in the process of
10 doing that.

11 We have not completed that analysis yet.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Do you have all the
13 sampling you need?

14 MS. FANELLI: We have a bunch of sample
15 because we have sampling historically from even fillsite
16 6A that we can use. We have some data from 6B. We have
17 data from 207/231.

18 So we have data from all over that we are
19 using to complete that analysis.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Does this all have
21 a consistent history or just a patchwork of stuff? Do
22 you have an idea?

23 MS. FANELLI: The fill in this area looks
24 pretty much like it was placed around the same timeframe.
25 It was placed to create buildable land?

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Oakey doke.

2 MS. FANELLI: But that's a good comment.

3 But we're looking at it chemically first.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

5 MS. FANELLI: And we do have some trench
6 logs, boring logs that gives some information about the
7 nature of the fill.

8 It all seems to be the common picture of
9 colma and dune sand mixture essentially.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It had been a big
11 area?

12 MS. FANELLI: We've been asked
13 specifically to look at old fill in the area where it
14 occurs, it's in the future Quartermaster Reach and the
15 riparian corridor. That's in the area that we've been
16 asked to look at.

17 DTSC will take a look at that and make a
18 decision whether that old fill has any constituents in it
19 that they feel require regulation under CERCLA.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. BERMAN: Can you just tell me what you
22 mean by old fill?

23 MS. FANELLI: Old fill was a term that was
24 coined before I got here, and it seems to be areas within
25 the Presidio where historically the land was fills. It's

1 not a debris fill. It's like an earth fill, and it was
2 filled close to the turn of the century in order to
3 actually construct buildings, and we use a map -- we use
4 a -- let me grab it here.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But they were
6 filling the low lying land to build buildings?

7 MS. FANELLI: We use this map which is a
8 map which shows the difference in elevation between 1871
9 and I think 2001, contours. Areas of cut are red. Areas
10 of fill are blue.

11 And so the old fill that we're basically
12 talking about in the Tennessee Hollow here is this area
13 here.

14 So 6A was right up here. This would be
15 where Quartermaster Reach is.

16 And so we've been asked to look at the
17 occurrence of old fill in the area where the future land
18 use is restoration of native habitat.

19 MR. BERMAN: So when you look at it, you
20 can just tell by the demarkation that it's a fill, and
21 how do you know that it's old?

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They've encountered
23 it in several projects now.

24 MS. FANELLI: We have.

25 MS. COYLE: Well, it's also underneath a

1 lot of infrastructure that was put there by the Army many
2 years ago. It's been under buildings that we know has
3 been there seventy, eighty years.

4 MR. BERMAN: So that -- it's defined by
5 something that's underneath something else, right? I
6 mean, it's not close to the surface.

7 MS. FANELLI: No. Sometimes it's just at
8 the surface. Some of these have been near modern fill at
9 the surface, asphalts or other grading. It's usually
10 distinct from the natives.

11 Sometimes we can see actually a grass layer
12 where the old fill is sitting on top of the native.

13 In 6B, as we've talked about, there's sort
14 of a higher level of, oh, anywhere from two to six feet
15 of -- of more dense building debris that's on top of the
16 old fill that's on top of a native horizon.

17 MR. BERMAN: So you discover it by your
18 sampling cores in this case?

19 MS. FANELLI: Right. Well, we use this as
20 an initial guide as to where it might be.

21 MR. BERMAN: Is there any reason to
22 believe that it's contaminated?

23 MS. FANELLI: Not necessarily. You know,
24 it really depends on the area, what the area was used
25 for.

1 I mean, if there's old fill in an area that
2 was grass, but then they put the gas station on top, then
3 yeah. We have contaminated old fill in 207/231. It's
4 because of the petroleum tanks. It's not because of the
5 old fill itself necessarily.

6 So that's what we're trying to distinguish
7 when we look at the old fill in these areas.

8 MS. GEE: So old fill dates back to how
9 early?

10 MS. FANELLI: I think down in that -- in
11 the northern area, a lot of it was -- we think is pretty
12 old, closer to the 1900s, early 1900s when the Army was
13 building out that area.

14 Okay. So fillsite 6B really is sort of
15 our -- our plan there or the presumed remedy there is a
16 manage in place remedy, and it is probably the last
17 document that we had that will be issued in some capacity
18 for public review as a decision document.

19 The BAPR, the Final Remedial Action
20 Workplan's been issued. We are getting big documents for
21 contractor selection out we hope in the next week or two,
22 and we hope to have construction started in July.

23 So it will be a busy summer. Baker Beach
24 1A, Baker Beach 2, Barnard Avenue and Mountain Lake all
25 going on at the same time.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Sounds like some
2 good tours.

3 MS. FANELLI: Building 937, Crissy Field,
4 that was cleaned under the Crissy Field RAP. We have a
5 site certification request in and we just haven't heard
6 any -- anything on that yet from DTSC.

7 207/231, the construction and completion
8 report is in preparation. In fact, the draft has been
9 waiting for me to take a look at it. It's been waiting a
10 couple of weeks. I need to get to that.

11 Once we get that pulled together, we'll be
12 submitting that. Groundwater monitoring we suspect will
13 be ongoing for a while.

14 And then Lobos Creek, the RI summary report
15 was submitted. Have we gotten written comments yet?

16 MS. COYLE: We have written comments from
17 Mark.

18 MS. FANELLI: Mark sent in comments.

19 MS. COYLE: We don't have comments yet
20 from the DTSC Regional Board.

21 I know they were considering your comments
22 at the board, as well, and then you can expect a comment
23 response sometime soon. I'm not sure how quickly Lori
24 will be able to respond.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Great.

1 MS. FANELLI: Okay. Lead-based paint.
2 You know, I don't think I updated these numbers. I think
3 it's a little bit higher. I think we're close to
4 submitting about 550 buildings for no further action
5 under the lead-based paint program.

6 I think unfortunately our number on
7 concurrence isn't much higher than the 283. DTSC's a
8 little bit backed up, but I know that DTSC has assigned
9 another person to review these, as well, so I'm hoping
10 that means we'll start getting additional closures on
11 that base cleanout or no further action letters.

12 Next quarter, I'm hoping that you're going
13 to see construction starts at Baker Beach 1A and 2.
14 We're hoping that we get the comments on Lobos Creek in
15 DTSC and that we'd be revising and resubmitting that
16 report.

17 And as you know, in that report, we've
18 asked for no further action. So that's our current
19 expectation, but we'll see what kind of comments we get.

20 We hope to have completed the contractor
21 selection for BAPR, and we're hoping to see the revised
22 summary with the RI issued, as well.

23 Under petroleum, the only site that's
24 really outstanding for us right now is 207/231 in terms
25 of the Water Board order, so I'm hoping to get that

1 construction completion report out.

2 We did complete one last activity, which
3 was soil gas sampling beneath building 228. That was a
4 requirement of the cap, and we did that last month, and I
5 don't think we detected anything above any cleanup
6 numbers, which is good news.

7 That's what we were hoping for with the in
8 situ cleanup that we did on the north side of the
9 building.

10 And so with that, we're hoping that we can
11 get closure on that site and go on with groundwater
12 monitoring.

13 And on lead-based paints, obviously we're
14 continuing to work our schedule on our list and hopefully
15 have the majority of sites where they're real buildings,
16 they're painted buildings and the paint's in stable
17 condition submitted before the end of summer, and then
18 we're dealing with these sort of oddball buildings.

19 MR. BERMAN: Has anyone estimated how many
20 tons of lead was on the Presidio before all this activity
21 occurred?

22 MS. FANELLI: In the ground?

23 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. Associated with the
24 lead-based paint.

25 MS. FANELLI: We have not, but it's funny

1 that you say that because we are going to have some
2 interns again this summer, and what I'm going to have one
3 of my interns do is go back to several of our cleanup --
4 our cleanup documents and calculate -- take the
5 concentration and calculate the mass of particular
6 contaminants and particular fills and calculate how much
7 we removed.

8 So I'll probably have one of my interns
9 start to look at that, see what the results say.

10 MR. BERMAN: You would think that it's a
11 significant number. That's why I was saying how many
12 tons.

13 MS. FANELLI: Right. Definitely some of
14 our highest lead concentrations in any of our cleanup
15 sites have been associated with lead-based paint even
16 more so than several of the debris fill sites.

17 So that is good that we've gotten that out
18 of the shallow soil.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Can you calculate how much
20 lead as opposed to lead contaminated soil?

21 MS. FANELLI: We can calculate lead. We
22 can subtract that out, because we do have background
23 numbers for lead.

24 MR. BERMAN: Isn't the background lead
25 level very low?

1 MS. FANELLI: It's low, I think.

2 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

3 MS. COYLE: Yes.

4 MR. BERMAN: It's probably a very small
5 number to subtract out. Whether you got an estimate or
6 not. It probably doesn't make much difference.

7 MS. FANELLI: But there's been several
8 sites that have very high levels of lead. These big
9 clabbered white painted structures that have been there
10 for a long time. A lot of paint has flaked on the ground
11 with those.

12 Okay. So the last two sides are just sort
13 of is the ones that I've been including on BB1A and 2
14 activities and we kind out just where we are.

15 On BB1A, we're doing soil removal. We're
16 starting early June, and the exciting thing we've been
17 deploying of the bridge across from the parking lot
18 across to the battery. So that will be an exciting
19 activity.

20 Baker Beach 2, we're just a little bit
21 behind. We're finishing up the RDIP, the design
22 documents, but we're hoping for debris removal no later
23 than July on that.

24 MR. BERMAN: So if you look at the -- the
25 budget for Baker Beach 2 and cumulative to date, there's

1 like four million dollars.

2 So are you going to be using all that up?

3 MS. FANELLI: Baker Beach 2 budget, four
4 million dollars? There's contingency in there.

5 MR. BERMAN: Cumulative is 1.3 and I'm
6 looking at the activities, and I was wondering if that
7 means given the activities, whether you'll have a chunk
8 left over.

9 MS. FANELLI: We might. There's
10 contingency built into both Baker Beach 1A and Baker
11 Beach 2 because they're removal projects, and depending
12 on the waste classification and the actual volumes we can
13 get, those are cost drivers.

14 So we get swings. We do carry a chunk of
15 contingency in those two.

16 But under our current estimates, those
17 should come in under the budget.

18 MR. BERMAN: Because it looks like there's
19 over four million dollars between what's cumulative and
20 what the budget is, and then it's only the debris removal
21 is the main tax on that.

22 MS. FANELLI: Right. Well, we have the
23 removal. We have the back import fill, and then we have
24 the site restoration costs, but it really depends on how
25 much material we have to truck offsite.

1 Right now, we're estimating 6,700 yards,
2 and if that goes up, then our costs are going to go up
3 for Baker Beach 2.

4 So they are meant to be conservative.
5 We're not meant to go over them, although sometimes we
6 do. Our goal into come in under that.

7 MR. BERMAN: The other BB2 activities like
8 the restoration, that's not on this slide, right?

9 MS. FANELLI: It's in the budget, but the
10 restoration details aren't in there, no.

11 BB2 will be graded back. We've been
12 working with the Park Service. We're going to use the
13 serpentine that came from Doyle there so we can create
14 some addition serpentine habitat, and that's kind of a
15 win-win for all of us, and then it will be plant
16 following Park Service's guidance on plant layout, et
17 cetera, for that area.

18 MR. BERMAN: So Caltrans says you can have
19 it, but the Presidio pays for the trucking and movement
20 and everything to collect it and they move it over?

21 MS. FANELLI: This is serpentine that we
22 got free of charge last year from Caltrans -- two years
23 ago from Caltrans when we were doing the rebuilding of
24 the slope at former landfill 2. So this is excess.

25 We would otherwise haul it offsite and

1 dispose of it, but if we can use it for habitat at Baker
2 Beach 2, that's great. So that's what I mean by that.

3 It didn't come to us with any cost in the
4 beginning from Caltrans. I'm sure it was a win for
5 Caltrans.

6 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. It looks like
7 everybody --

8 MS. FANELLI: Everybody won. That's so
9 unusual, so that's good. Everybody feels good about it.

10 You know, and I just realized that I didn't
11 update the Mountain Lake activity slide, so I apologize
12 for that, but the area's done. Dredging, change it to
13 May and we're off and running.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Could I ask a question I
15 forgot to ask? This is a wonderful elaborate whole
16 system there.

17 How many hours a day is it going to go?

18 MR. BERMAN: 24.

19 MS. COYLE: Well, the dredge itself, the
20 dredging is going to occur 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday
21 through Saturday, so those are ten-hour days, but the
22 water treatment system operates 24 hours a day up in the
23 material handling there.

24 So there will be workers there and a
25 security guard there 24 hours a day managing the water

1 and the discharge.

2 MR. TECZUN: You can't turn it off. Once
3 you've pressurized those tubes, they will continue to
4 reap water.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Does the dredging -- is it a
6 noise that gets to any residential places? What is the
7 reason for not having it longer?

8 MS. COYLE: It's --

9 MS. CHEEVER: It's a good amount of time.

10 MS. COYLE: I think you pay a premium if
11 you're working 24 hours a day or on Sundays, and we can
12 fit all the dredging that we need to do in the summer, so
13 it made sense balancing the costs how long to operate.

14 But you're right. I don't think the noise
15 is much. You heard it today. It was kind of just a low
16 hum in the lake.

17 It will start up at 7:00 AM the rest of
18 this week, so we'll see if any neighbors have any issues
19 with it, but I don't suspect much.

20 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. You were fortunate
21 that the -- the dredger has enough power to pump
22 everything up to the station --

23 MS. COYLE: Right.

24 MR. BERMAN: -- without having an
25 intermediary --

1 MS. COYLE: Right.

2 MR. BERMAN: -- along the way, which would
3 have been noisy.

4 MS. COYLE: We originally thought that we
5 would need a booster bump, but we didn't need that.

6 MR. BERMAN: Is anyone taking a film
7 record of what's going on?

8 MS. COYLE: We have -- our construction
9 managers are out there all day who are taking photos
10 constantly. We've got a good photo sequence of what's
11 going on.

12 MS. FANELLI: We don't have video.

13 MR. BERMAN: It's actually a very dramatic
14 site if you wanted to have a little PR of how the -- how
15 the remediation project does great things.

16 It's beautiful. The action is very
17 elaborate and it would make a nice little ten- or
18 fifteen-minute film.

19 MS. COYLE: Yeah. We do have like one of
20 the reporters for SF Gate or Examiner coming out again.
21 So there will be some opportunities there for certainly
22 written articles.

23 I haven't heard of any news or anything
24 more than that, but --

25 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure Zurich would

1 reimburse a video, so I'm sure I won't get authorization
2 to hire a videographer. It would be nice.

3 MR. BERMAN: It's kind of the thing
4 that -- I mean, years from now when people think about
5 their Presidio, you have this library with all these
6 reports and then there's a few short films here and there
7 that show, you know, landfill E and -- and Mountain Lake
8 and maybe --

9 MS. FANELLI: We can do a montage of
10 photographs, and we're trying to take pictures from the
11 same vantage point so we can put them together over time.
12 I know Mark's done that with some of our photographs.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Landfill 2. Yeah.
14 It's interesting. I'm not sure how useful.

15 MS. BLUM: It's a nice project. It's a
16 learning experience, as well.

17 MS. CHEEVER: I was just thinking. I
18 don't in any way think you should be spending precious
19 Money on video, but you do have the public information
20 sector of the Trust, and as people have been saying, it
21 is a very appealing project.

22 I think there have been some projects where
23 for example a whole lot of trees have come down where the
24 project itself might have been controversial.

25 Here, because so many people care about the

1 lake, it would be good to explain why the lake will be
2 much better once it's dredged.

3 So if your public information department
4 ever felt like telling -- and as Sam says, it's so
5 dramatic. If I were a TV station looking for interesting
6 things to put on my broadcast, you know, it makes a very
7 good picture. Just a thought.

8 It would just take a phone call. Don't you
9 like that?

10 MS. THOMAS: I just wanted to say that
11 there has been a film funded through Natural Resources
12 with -- through the -- the film maker who did the other
13 couple natural resources, Thompson's Reach, Peabody, and
14 she's -- I think she's going to interview Gen Coyle.

15 So I think a piece on it. It's three years
16 of filming, so there's a piece on it that's a background
17 of Mountain Lake, a piece on it for reading.

18 I hate to interact. I thought since you
19 were talking about it, we can work together to make sure
20 that remediation is represented in on appropriate way and
21 has the kind of filming that you wanted.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There's not a lot
23 to see over time. The lake stays the same, but isn't
24 going to change very dramatically. It wouldn't take a
25 lot of film, actually.

1 MR. BERMAN: Yeah, right, but it's just
2 such a nice story.

3 MS. FANELLI: Send an e-mail to Joshua
4 Steinberg and say the RAB thinks this would be a great
5 idea to highlight remediation of Mountain Lake and do a
6 film.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Who's that?

8 MS. FANELLI: He's a --

9 MS. BLUM: Communications.

10 MS. CHEEVER: For the Trust?

11 MS. COYLE: Internal Affairs.

12 MS. BLUM: Director of cultural resources
13 or something. There have been a lot of changes, but they
14 haven't really publicized them.

15 MS. GEE: I think the back part, because
16 those sediments are good, like up to two -- thirty feet
17 or something.

18 MS. COYLE: They change over time, yeah.

19 MS. GEE: Once a week.

20 MS. BLUM: Bumping. It will be very
21 interesting.

22 MS. FANELLI: Maybe we can go out there.
23 The public RAB's participation.

24 MS. GEE: We can do a little measure.

25 MR. BERMAN: I would want Eileen to be a

1 narrator for the film.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's one of the
3 most high profiled parks, a connection to the City,
4 almost --

5 MS. GEE: You can take it from the
6 roadway, too, and get more of a perspective.

7 MS. BLUM: We've had such a long history,
8 the swans, maybe or Myrtle or whatever her name was.
9 That's when I first heard about it.

10 MS. COYLE: It should come out, the
11 changes in construction.

12 MS. FANELLI: Great. So ask and see if
13 you guys get a response.

14 MS. BLUM: You know, Sam brought up a good
15 question about the lead-based paint, and well before I
16 was on the RAB, they took down all the barracks at Crissy
17 Field. I don't know how many there were, twenty, thirty.

18 Were they part of remediation? Do you
19 remember, Mark?

20 MS. FANELLI: It was before the Trust
21 existed.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Army tested.

23 MS. BLUM: The Army tested.

24 MS. BLUM: And probably didn't find
25 anything.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: No.

2 MS. BLUM: How did I know that?

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Army was working with
4 the state, the state -- testing that was required, the
5 Army did it and they found no lead.

6 MS. BLUM: Okay.

7 MS. GEE: Would Caltrans be taking some
8 photos, too, on the early process of their --

9 MS. FANELLI: They probably do have some
10 and we have some photos.

11 MS. GEE: That might be a good way to --

12 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. It is part of it
13 because it is an element of the Remedial Action Plan.

14 MR. BERMAN: Film archives are very good
15 educational tools and historical reservations of the
16 changes in the Presidio, and the Presidio has changed a
17 lot, but nothing as dramatic at this short period of
18 time.

19 I mean, it's -- you know, the kind of
20 remarkable transformation over a short period of time,
21 and a few sites just stand out as being very photogenic.

22 MS. CHEEVER: I was asking how it looks
23 during different stages of the remediation, but when it's
24 all done, will a nice citizen of San Francisco walking
25 down to the beach say, "Oh, I can see that the lake was

1 dredged"?

2 MS. THOMAS: I don't think they'll see
3 that the lake was dredged. I think they'll see beautiful
4 lake. I hope it looks a little different than when fish
5 were dying and algae was --

6 MS. CHEEVER: Because maybe there won't be
7 algae.

8 MS. THOMAS: Hopefully it will be
9 submerged. It will be natural looking vegetation.
10 Hopefully it will be clearer. A lot has to happen
11 between now and then.

12 MR. BERMAN: They'll just see a large
13 glass pot of gray looking pennies.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: On the Mountain
15 Lake, we had been talking about the stone columns they
16 installed.

17 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And I came across
19 some old information about -- that I had forgotten in the
20 Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, that eastern lane of
21 Highway 1 actually failed and subsided four feet.

22 And so --

23 MR. TECZUN: I've heard that. I don't
24 believe that, but -- I don't believe that. There's not
25 that much of a grade difference.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There is actually a
2 report from Caltrans. It's lateral spreading from
3 liquefaction.

4 So the stone columns, you know, were
5 necessary for the liquefaction issue, primarily,
6 stabilizing -- so stabilizing the embankment from
7 subsidence in an earthquake while you're dredging the
8 lake or something like that.

9 But I had forgotten completely that it had
10 damage to that eastern lane during the Loma Prieta
11 earthquake. So they knew there was liquefaction and
12 lateral spreading problem there already.

13 I just thought I'd follow up with that.
14 You were the stone column guy during the --

15 MR. BERMAN: During the public hearings,
16 yeah.

17 MS. BLUM: When we were out there, there
18 was a lot of glare on the water. I was trying to see if
19 you could actually see the stone.

20 MR. TECZUN: No. You weren't able to.

21 MS. BLUM: So are we under the roadway?
22 Are they buried?

23 MS. FANELLI: I think they're primarily
24 under the pavement section. Maybe not.

25 MR. TECZUN: The very innermost column, a

1 portion of it might be underneath the shoulder asphalt.

2 MS. COYLE: But you still wouldn't see it
3 because it's still underground. There's no visual aspect
4 from it.

5 MS. BLUM: There's nothing on the edge at
6 all.

7 MS. COYLE: I think they stopped within
8 seven feet of the top. I don't even think -- you
9 wouldn't walk out there and see the holes or anything.
10 You know, the top layers's filled with, I think, soil or
11 something.

12 MR. TECZUN: Soil.

13 MS. COYLE: So there's nothing to see.

14 MR. TECZUN: After they installed the
15 columns, they went back and trenched through the whole
16 area and put the pipe in.

17 Even if these columns, you could see like
18 these circular columns at the surface with gravel
19 expression, that all got obliterated when they put the
20 piping in.

21 MR. BERMAN: Does Caltrans have any
22 provision for examining these columns at all? There's no
23 little subterranean railroad track that goes around and
24 looks at them?

25 MS. FANELLI: I don't think so. I don't

1 think there's O&M associated with them.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They're all full of
3 gravel, so --

4 MR. TECZUN: They didn't dig a hole. They
5 just placed the hole. They did test pile initially to
6 see whether or not there is the densification that they
7 needed.

8 So once they knew that, they installed the
9 rest of the columns. You know that the soil in between
10 is dense per the technical design.

11 MR. BERMAN: So they were just pounded in,
12 basically.

13 MR. TECZUN: Yeah. They drilled the top
14 seven feet, but after that, all the energy behind it was
15 just vibrating it down.

16 MS. GEE: Luckily they don't have any
17 cracked bolts.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Are you
19 finished, Eileen?

20 MS. FANELLI: I am not.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Any questions or
22 comments for Eileen? Quarterly report.

23 MR. BERMAN: I just think it's impressive
24 that the budget deficit is all going to be absorbed by
25 Zurich.

1 You've done a fabulous job to somehow make
2 that budget deficit not a penalty for the general fund at
3 the Presidio.

4 MS. FANELLI: Thank you. There's lots of
5 folks in the legal department behind that, too.

6 I remember that there was criticism from us
7 because that insurance deal was negotiated in private,
8 basically, and so none of us were involved.

9 So it was just -- a hundred million, seven
10 million for an insurance policy. We were kind of shocked
11 basically when it came out of a closed door meeting, but,
12 yeah, it all worked out good.

13 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Got to trust your
15 upper management sometimes, huh?

16 Jim Meadow, he was quite the character.

17 MR. BERMAN: Right. I certainly remember
18 some uncomfortable statements made in the RAB and we had
19 the attorneys that told us about the closed door meeting
20 and I think -- he was extremely proud of this.

21 He thought it -- that he really did a
22 wonderful thing for the Presidio with the insurance
23 policy.

24 MS. FANELLI: I remember they were in
25 difficult negotiations, the Army and so I think he felt

1 he came out with the best he could get.

2 MR. BERMAN: Mm-hmm. And it's still a
3 puzzle to me why so much of the policy details are
4 redacted from the public.

5 I mean, given -- now given that -- that
6 Zurich is really paying, maybe there's some
7 justification, but I would sort of think it would be the
8 other way around, that they wouldn't want anything
9 redacted anymore.

10 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure --

11 MS. BLUM: I think it would be
12 competition.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I think the last
14 versions were not redacted.

15 MR. BERMAN: Oh, really?

16 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure it was even the
17 Trust that was doing the redacting. I think it was
18 Zurich.

19 MR. BERMAN: Oh, yes. It was definitely
20 Zurich that was doing that, and when we tried to get
21 information -- and this is maybe when you first came
22 on -- no. It was before.

23 MS. FANELLI: Before.

24 MR. BERMAN: And we tried to get
25 information, and Trust personnel were -- had seen the

1 redacted parts, but were more or less telling us that
2 under oath, they couldn't reveal it, and it was -- given
3 the history of this, it's sort of peculiar.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But subsequent to
5 that, the unredacted versions were part of the lawsuit or
6 something like that.

7 MS. FANELLI: I think Zurich attached it
8 as part of their documents.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's right. They
10 attached the unredacted versions to the court.

11 MR. BERMAN: By mistake. I remember that.
12 We all had a good laugh about that after Doug had spent
13 enormous amounts of time trying to find out what was in
14 the redacted parts.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Interesting. Okay.
16 Moving on to topic B, Mountain Lake, North Arm Settlement
17 Sample Work Plan.

18 I believe I sent my comments out, and
19 basically put that on the agenda to make sure that I
20 guess my comments got to and they're in process.

21 MS. COYLE: We've gone through them and we
22 need time to get them responded to. We just need time to
23 get them done. They're coming.

24 We're hoping to do that sampling soon
25 because, you know, everybody really wants to know what's

1 really happening out there in that area, so --

2 MS. FANELLI: It was a pretty
3 comprehensive sampling plan to start with.

4 Has everybody seen the plan? You don't
5 have a bigger version of that handy, do you?

6 MS. COYLE: No, not on me. The only
7 version I have is that.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Basically they
9 estimated the area of the central settlement. Would that
10 be the outside boundary there?

11 MS. COYLE: So that polygon there is
12 actually a survey wetland. So we had H.D. Harvey survey
13 the wetland boundary in that area. That's what that
14 boundary -- yes. Exactly.

15 And so we know that that's where the water
16 has deposited and most likely would be where the sediment
17 would deposit and wouldn't obviously go uphill from
18 there.

19 And Rick, you can talk about what your
20 geologist has seen out there in terms of seeing -- it's
21 pretty clear where the sediment has deposited.

22 MR. TECZUN: When we did the first phase
23 of sampling, those initial four samples or so, after we
24 got the results back and were planning the second phase,
25 we were asking the geologist about the material out

1 there.

2 He said it's a pretty stark transition.
3 When you're in the flow line of that channel, it's very
4 sandy.

5 As soon as you step out of what you would
6 call the channel proper, it becomes more humid, much more
7 overgrown with vegetation.

8 Had someone gone out there, you do a visual
9 check and know when you're in the channel, it would be
10 obvious sediment conditions versus going out to the area
11 that might mix intermittently with the water, which is
12 the wetland area.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm a little
14 confused. Is that jurisdictional wetland or -- I know
15 the NPS actually did a jurisdiction on it, there's a map
16 of jurisdictional wetland. It's a lot smaller than that
17 as I remember correctly.

18 I haven't seen it this vivid actually
19 before. So it kind of surprised me when I first saw
20 that, so --

21 MS. COYLE: It's a potential
22 jurisdictional wetland. What H.D. Harvey did is they
23 went out and mapped it, it could be jurisdictional, but
24 the core hasn't come out and said yes. It might be a
25 little bit bigger than previous maps.

1 Really what we wanted H.D. Harvey to do is
2 to go out there and find the wetland mapping, which I
3 think was 2004 timeframe.

4 MS. FANELLI: We did some for the RAP,
5 too, as part of the Remedial Action Plan. That's what
6 this is.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Could you explain what
8 jurisdictional wetland is?

9 MS. COYLE: Terri, you might know.
10 There's a difference about the habitat. There's
11 something about the soil character characteristics,
12 what's growing in there that make it either
13 jurisdictional or -- the Fish and Wildlife Service has
14 their own criteria.

15 I'm not too familiar with all the --

16 MS. CHEEVER: What agency does
17 jurisdictional refer to?

18 MS. COYLE: Army Corps of Engineers.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So if you're
20 building something and it's in a jurisdictional wetland,
21 there's a whole other set of requirements to meet.
22 Mitigation has to be done, setbacks and there's a lot of
23 issues if it becomes jurisdictional.

24 I'm not sure why I'm even saying
25 jurisdictional. That's why it's been said in the past.

1 I don't know if it makes a difference or not.

2 This is more in line of what I saw when I
3 looked out there. I'm just saying, okay. I'm a little
4 surprised as big as it is.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's the same figure that
6 should have been in the Remedial Action Plan, then.

7 MS. COYLE: This hasn't changed since last
8 year. You may be talking about older maps, and I haven't
9 personally overlaid the two.

10 MR. TECZUN: When we prepared that figure,
11 it just kind of disappears with all the topo lines.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I kind of freaked
13 out because I think I had commented that I thought it was
14 larger, and then some of them are expressed an opinion
15 that it might end up being smaller.

16 So it was influx at that time, which is
17 more of the final.

18 And then, you know, there were some
19 interesting things on there. On the top there, it was
20 two channels, kind of showing the split in the channels.

21 MR. TECZUN: I don't know if I saw that.
22 There's certainly drainage coming off of West Pacific to
23 the side, too.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So that was one of
25 my comments. It kind of looked like there was a channel

1 from both pipes. If you look at this arm here, it kind
2 of looks like this goes up to pipe four, what's flowing
3 right now.

4 MR. TECZUN: These are the topographic
5 lines. They all point that way. You've got a channel
6 that pretty much goes right there.

7 The vegetation is growing in a weird way
8 right there, but if you look at the dashed lines, there's
9 not really a channel going that way. There's actually a
10 long level contour. That wouldn't be a channel.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: What's these two
12 hashed line here?

13 MR. TECZUN: There's nothing between those
14 lines. Yeah, this is the boundary of the wetland that
15 H.D. Harvey saw out there.

16 Wherever you see that sort of V shape going
17 up, it all kind of goes in way and you've got your pipe
18 outlets there and I imagine it bends this way because
19 there's a bend right here, also.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So where is the
21 sand sediment?

22 MR. TECZUN: As I understand it, these
23 ones that are shaded in are the samples that were
24 initially collected.

25 So the geologist spent most of his time in

1 there collecting those samples. Those were kind of sandy
2 looking, and as you veer up this way or that way, he was
3 looking for that at some point. It changes noticeably.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: All right. So
5 would be a wetland, it wouldn't be sand? That doesn't
6 make sense.

7 MR. TECZUN: Not necessarily, but it might
8 be in the channel, which is what he saw.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So somewhere inside
10 this hashed line is the sand channel where the sand
11 sediment and contamination would be?

12 MR. TECZUN: Yeah, so what we're doing --

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: He couldn't see
14 that if he wanted to.

15 MR. TECZUN: I don't know how that would
16 be pertinent for remediation. What we're doing right
17 here, the theory, if the contaminant like lead are
18 attached to sediments, then they would be transported by
19 runoff. So it's a water borne contamination.

20 So where would the water go? Looking at
21 the wetland, that kind of tells you the furthest extent
22 of water, which is the furthest extent of possible
23 demonstrates sediment. So that's what we need to do.

24 How big of an impact are we looking at?

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: My comment up here,

1 on this sample here, the SE-303, if this did continue up
2 and this was the current channel --

3 MR. TECZUN: What I'm telling you is it
4 wouldn't do that, right? Because these are level
5 contours. It's going to be perpendicular to contour.
6 That's how things flow.

7 If you look at those V sort of shapes to
8 the contours, that's the flow line to the panel.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: How interesting.

10 MR. TECZUN: Which is why we target these
11 along the channel line.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Is this between the
13 hashed lines?

14 MS. FANELLI: It's an area of non-wetland
15 plants.

16 MS. COYLE: I don't know if H.D. Harvey
17 was that specific with what they saw at that one
18 location. It could have been soils that fit some
19 criteria.

20 MR. TECZUN: They're walking around and
21 they're sort of tagging spots that look like the
22 wetlands, and they don't see anywhere else.

23 They come back and tag that and tag that.
24 It's got some weird jog in it.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Interesting. Okay.

1 Cool. Well, I had some comments on it. I didn't have
2 any additional samples, anyway. It's great that you have
3 as many samples as you do.

4 I kind of think that once you get out there
5 mobilized, the actual samples themselves are relatively
6 cheap to collect another lead sample so that you might as
7 well do as many as you can.

8 MS. COYLE: That's why we tried to put
9 this comprehensive plan together. We're doing a lot of
10 samples.

11 I know that one of your comments had to do
12 with taking another sample. I think you wanted one close
13 to the discharge here, and Lori had agreed with that. So
14 we've already directed him to put that.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I had a question
16 what this dashed line here.

17 MR. TECZUN: So what you see here is the
18 survey's product. They went out there and surveyed.
19 They can identify this drainage structure here.

20 It's a cross drain that takes drainage to
21 this drop box here to this right there. They can't
22 always see where the rest of the pipe goes. They don't
23 have a survey of the pipe going down.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Is this a sinkhole
25 down here?

1 MR. TECZUN: This is up on the slope.
2 This is at the toe of the slope. The report identified
3 by Caltrans identified some sinkhole over here, but they
4 don't actually have survey data confirm that this was a
5 pine loan.

6 You can surmise that it would be a pipe
7 alignment, which is why we dash it in as they think that
8 we think is there, but it hasn't been confirmed by
9 survey.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They haven't found
11 that out yet.

12 MR. TECZUN: We -- the geologist is still
13 going to have to locate it, when we do get our samples,
14 we'll get GPS locations and it lines up with the drain on
15 the roadway.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Great.

17 MS. CHEEVER: You didn't say so earlier,
18 but what agency are you with?

19 MR. TECZUN: I'm not with an agency. I'm
20 with Kennedy/Jenks.

21 MS. COYLE: He's our design engineer.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

23 MR. BERMAN: Is the sinkhole connected at
24 all to that pipe that you cannot find the exit?

25 MR. TECZUN: So the sinkhole, the theory

1 is that we have original design drawings that show that
2 that cross drain from the roadway via pipe was connected
3 to the drain pipes in the north arm at a manhole, but
4 they can't find that.

5 What they did find is a sinkhole that lines
6 up with where that cross drain is. What they think is
7 that cross drain pipe the slope via a pipe and the pipe
8 just terminates right there, and the water that comes out
9 of the roadway and has slowly over time created a
10 sinkhole there.

11 MS. FANELLI: Sinkhole's probably not the
12 right word. It's more like a scour hole because it's not
13 subsiding because there's nothing underneath it. It's
14 just it's being eroded out.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's a good place
16 to put a sample. Because that's where a sediment does
17 accumulate.

18 MS. FANELLI: If it's being scoured, it
19 wouldn't.

20 MR. TECZUN: I was almost think you find
21 it and you sample just to the side of it.

22 MS. COYLE: But we have one right at the
23 discharge and we also have one a few feet toward the
24 middle there.

25 MR. TECZUN: The idea was to place those,

1 say the sample right at the erosive depression is hot
2 with lead, then you've got one ten feet away, so you can
3 kind of put some bounds around it.

4 MR. BERMAN: So was the pipe actually
5 intended in there or was it -- did it receive a break and
6 then allowed the spillage in the development of this --
7 I'll call it a contaminant marsh.

8 MR. TECZUN: I would surmise that since
9 there are design drawings showing that cross drain
10 connected to the drainage pipe in the north arm via a
11 manhole, that the intention was to connect the whole
12 system together.

13 Whether it was actually in the past,
14 there's no way to tell. It might have been at one point.
15 There isn't right now.

16 MR. BERMAN: Do you think it's something
17 that broke in '89?

18 MR. TECZUN: Maybe. We can't find the
19 manhole. It's a difference between what's actually
20 designed and constructed.

21 If the manhole and cross drain was
22 constructed like this, it's a possibility that they just
23 got severed.

24 MS. COYLE: We don't really see evidence
25 that the pipe had gone.

1 MR. TECZUN: They both terminate and you
2 can find those.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So it's unusual to
4 have as-built drawings that are wrong. In engineering,
5 that's pretty unusual, right.

6 MR. TECZUN: Well, with utility drawings
7 like this, it's unusual to actually find the as-built
8 drawings, so --

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's true. So it
10 kind of fooled several programs into thinking that the
11 sampling wasn't needed there because of these as-built
12 drawings. That's kind of why we were talking about this
13 today.

14 MR. BERMAN: But it makes sense to think
15 that at one time the design was to make it all connected.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Exactly. But
17 either they took it out at one point or they never
18 finished it, so --

19 MR. BERMAN: They found gold there. The
20 guy left.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I have another
22 question for you, too, sort of been struggling with this
23 issue of -- so the water that's flowing out of this pipe,
24 and it's in a sand channel, right? You can actually see
25 sand in -- have you been in there?

1 MR. TECZUN: No, I have not been in there.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No one's been in
3 there except me, I don't think.

4 MS. COYLE: Our -- KJ's representative.

5 MR. TECZUN: I personally haven't laid
6 eyes on it.

7 MS. COYLE: Our sampler has gone out
8 there.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I was calling this
10 a stream. That seems to be controversial. To me, it's
11 more of a habitat thing.

12 You know, if this water flowing in a
13 channel, then it could have aquatic species. It could
14 have riparian plants. It's a habitat so that it could be
15 significant.

16 It could be something that needs to be
17 protected, you know, and during the process of this whole
18 thing, the initial study and the RAP didn't really talk
19 about this area.

20 So when I say there's a spring there, I'm
21 concerned that it may not be protected in construction,
22 because it's not in the initial study and the FS/RAP, we
23 seem to be sending mixed messages.

24 MS. FANELLI: I never said there's no
25 water flowing there. Obviously we know there's about

1 forty gallons per minute flowing there from the under
2 drain of --

3 MR. TECZUN: Caltrans directs their
4 dewatering water from the tunnel to there, and that's
5 what supports the wetland going all the way out to here.
6 You can tell, the wetland ends where the discharge of the
7 pipes begins.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

9 MR. TECZUN: It's an anthropologic
10 source from the habitat.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Doesn't the water come from
12 the other side of the highway, though, when those springs
13 underneath?

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I have found spring
15 pipes from the drop boxes from the overpass. There's the
16 auxiliary, which are springs, and this whole north arm
17 was full of wells.

18 If you look, there's wells all over the
19 area. So I think there was always a groundwater resource
20 here.

21 MS. FANELLI: Oh, there's definitely a
22 groundwater resource. Nobody's denying that.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That was me that
24 found those springs, and maybe ten gallons, five to ten
25 gallons per minute are being added to the tunnel

1 discharge under the overpass there before it connects.

2 MR. TECZUN: The overpass is over here.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So it's mainly in
4 the drop boxes on the other side of the river. There
5 would be these drop boxes over here. There's like two
6 pipes over here and two pipes over here, one pipe over
7 here and two pipes over here inside the drop boxes.

8 If you open up, you actually see these
9 little pipes flowing with water. I hope it's freshwater.

10 Maybe you guys should check for cross
11 connections there. I'm assuming it's freshwater coming
12 in there.

13 MS. FANELLI: I think we know it's
14 freshwater.

15 MR. TECZUN: You mean pipes other than the
16 storm drain pipes?

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: This one in here,
18 it flows pretty good, twenty gallons per minute, and then
19 off to the side, there's another pipe flowing with water
20 dropping in and there's two more pipes over here with
21 water dropping in.

22 MR. TECZUN: I thought that Joe had looked
23 at all of that and had sort of inventoried all the
24 drainage going in this area?

25 MS. FANELLI: There is a portion of storm

1 water on the area that discharges. We do know it's not a
2 hundred percent.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: This wasn't storm
4 water. It was freshwater. It wasn't during the storm
5 season. I'm hoping it's not sewage.

6 MS. FANELLI: I doubt it.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I can take you
8 there. We can look at that. That's an easy one.

9 But what's more difficult to me, what to
10 call the water flowing between the end of the pipe and
11 the lake.

12 There's a stretch where the water actually
13 flows in a sand channel within the wetland. You know,
14 I've been saying it's a stream and that it's riparian,
15 because it's flowing on the surface in a riparian
16 habitat.

17 It's been there for seventy years or 75
18 years. There's long enough to have riparian plants and
19 aquatic life.

20 My concern is since no one seems to be
21 talking about it, it's not recognized. It's not in the
22 initial study in the FS, so who is going to protect that
23 during construction and excavation of sediment?

24 I'm not sure even who is going to excavate
25 the sediment? Is Caltrans going to do that? Are you

1 guys going to do that?

2 MS. FANELLI: Remediation will clean up
3 any sediment that needs to be cleaned up in that area.
4 We anticipate it will be in the wetland area, not in the
5 upland area.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Is the upland
7 area -- is the end of the pipe in the upland area?

8 MR. TECZUN: No. These contours here
9 describe a very tall slope that goes up to the roadway
10 embankment.

11 What Eileen is saying in the areas that are
12 low, topographically in terms of elevation, that's where
13 the water is, that's where the wetland is, but as you go
14 up the slope, it's more of an upland area. It's not
15 inundated by this area where the water is constantly
16 flowing.

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: You talk about
18 upland, woodland habitat and then wetland habitat.

19 MS. FANELLI: What restoration plan are
20 you referring to?

21 MS. COYLE: Probably the enhancement plan.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Isn't there a
23 boundary between wetland or woodland, woodland riparian
24 habitat?

25 MS. COYLE: I believe the enhancement plan

1 does have some woodland habitat. I don't think it
2 actually defines the wetland coming through here.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm actually
4 confused about what "woodland" means.

5 Where's the boundary between upland and
6 wetland?

7 MS. FANELLI: This is the wetland
8 boundary.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

10 MS. FANELLI: And the RAP identified. And
11 the RAP identified this boundary, and if we did cleanup
12 in it, we would -- the RAP also acknowledges that we'd be
13 impacting that wetland or wetlands around the perimeter
14 of the lake where we did our work, and obviously we do
15 our work to minimize the impact.

16 If it's healthy, maybe that's a sign that
17 the contaminants are not significant and we would restore
18 it back to its current wetland.

19 MS. COYLE: Our RAP actually had some
20 significant disruption in this area, because originally
21 instead of using an east access road that we were going
22 to have, we were actually going to be coming in here and
23 building this access to the north arm.

24 There was in the RAP certainly some impact
25 here, and I think we were questioning about does the FS/

1 RAP and CEQA cover impact.

2 It does in the sense that it talks about
3 any wetlands that would be impacted would be restored in
4 kind with wetland. It talks about any vegetation that we
5 take out needs to be restored in compliance with the
6 vegetation management plan and restoration plan.

7 So I guess I'm trying to follow what your
8 concern is about if we did need to come in here and
9 remove some sediment, what the concern is that we
10 wouldn't put it back in a manner that wasn't compliant
11 with restoration standard.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's confusing,
13 because in the responsiveness summary, it says no
14 excavation activities are planned in here.

15 MS. FANELLI: And we're anticipating none.

16 MS. COYLE: I think what it -- what I view
17 this as is what DTSC views as a particular over-
18 satisfaction project.

19 We have our landfills where we start with a
20 prism, but it turns out based on other confirmation
21 sampling, that we have to step out into areas that we
22 didn't expect, but FS/RAP and CEQA still cover those
23 impacts in terms of what you need to do if you do go into
24 those habitat areas.

25 What DTSC is viewing this as, this is just

1 additional removal that would need to be done, you know,
2 as part of. You're right. It wasn't anticipated, and
3 because we didn't know that this contamination existed
4 there, but I still feel that the FS/RAP allows us to go
5 in there and remove any more contamination that needs
6 removal.

7 MR. TECZUN: I suppose if you were
8 proposing to pursue a different type of remedial
9 activity, that might be inconsistent with the FS/RAP. If
10 you were going to go in there and cap the whole area.

11 MS. COYLE: Sure.

12 MR. TECZUN: I'm assuming that we would
13 excavate, that's consistent with dredging. They're both
14 removal strategies.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Just to summarize,
16 then, basically the RAP covers the inside of this hashed
17 boundary is what you're saying? The wetland areas
18 discussed in the RAP includes this here up to the mouth
19 of the pipes?

20 MS. FANELLI: The wetland was delineated
21 the same in the RAPs.

22 MS. COYLE: Right.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And so it's just
24 semantics whether or not this is a stream within a
25 wetland or a wetland or, you know, whatever, it's more or

1 less semantics.

2 MR. TECZUN: The sandy quote unquote
3 channel, those are sand deposits that were deposited by
4 runoff. You're talking about sand deposits or granular
5 deposits picked up off the roadway.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

7 MR. TECZUN: We're not talking about an in
8 situ land channel that exists regardless of the water
9 source.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I don't think that
11 under CEQA, what biological impacts wouldn't make a
12 difference. It's either a habitat or it's not. Whether
13 it's sand from the roadway or natural sand, it wouldn't
14 make a difference.

15 MR. TECZUN: If it's a sand channel.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If it's a sand
17 channel, there's a different habitat from a march. A
18 sand channel has a different species from a marsh or bog.

19 MR. TECZUN: I think I'd go with the
20 determination that H.D. Harvey had.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So any impacts,
22 too, inside of that hashed line will be mitigated.

23 MS. FANELLI: In kind.

24 MS. COYLE: Absolutely.

25 MR. CHESTER: Or some sort of language.

1 MS. FANELLI: It would be restored. We
2 would remove the contamination and then rebuild it to
3 function as it does today I under the RAB.

4 MS. COYLE: I think the ARARs, where we
5 have to list all the laws and requirements, that's in the
6 RAP and that certainly says in there "hey, if you come
7 into an area that's a wetland, executive order says we
8 have to rebuild it as it was before."

9 So certainly -- and we have the enhancement
10 plan and the VMP and the PTEM, but all those other
11 restoration guidance documents that we're required to
12 comply with at the RAP.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: This is more for
14 Terri. Is there a difference between restoring it to a
15 stream than restoring it to a wetland?

16 In my mind, I see marsh versus flowing
17 stream. There's different species. So maybe it's just
18 semantics, but to me, if you're going to restore it back
19 to wetland, that's not what's inside the sand channel.
20 It may be semantics.

21 MS. COYLE: Certainly we couldn't turn
22 this into a marsh, because we do have the flow. The flow
23 is still going to have to come out of that pipe and go
24 down.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Once you estimate

1 the sediment, it could be lower. I don't know if you
2 want to put a marsh back there instead of a flowing
3 stream.

4 MS. THOMAS: I haven't looked at it at
5 all.

6 MS. CHEEVER: How do you do that when you
7 have forty gallons a minute?

8 MS. COYLE: It's a pretty substantial
9 flow. I would start with just like we would at any other
10 site, which is assume that we would backfill it up to --

11 MS. FANELLI: Right.

12 MS. COYLE: -- current grade, and that's
13 what we would do now.

14 If there was a desire that there be less
15 soil there for some other restoration plan, I don't think
16 we have a --

17 MS. FANELLI: Right. It just has to
18 function properly and has to pass the water without
19 causing erosion.

20 So, you know, our desire would be to take
21 it back to what it is today.

22 MR. BERMAN: Does that mean you would
23 sample the water to see whether it's freshwater.

24 MS. FANELLI: It is freshwater. It's not
25 sewage. We know it's not sewage.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's good
2 freshwater. Forty gallons a minute of freshwater on a
3 perennial basis. This is a rare resource, actually.

4 MS. CHEEVER: Is there any thought about
5 how important it is to feeding the lake?

6 MS. FANELLI: It is a major input of water
7 into the lake.

8 MS. CHEEVER: I had two questions. One is
9 that to the extent that the stream or this flow is
10 groundwater from under the tunnel, that groundwater
11 originally before the tunnel ever existed would have
12 been -- come up in springs, wouldn't it have and created
13 a stream? Maybe not a year-round stream, but a stream.

14 So can't one say that a possible stream
15 goes all the way back to the tunnel?

16 MS. COYLE: Yeah. I think the lake.

17 MS. THOMAS: The lake went all the way
18 back. You can see topography, the lake went all the way
19 back there. They filled in the lake.

20 MS. FANELLI: They filled in a portion of
21 the lake. There wouldn't have been a stream in this
22 location because this location was a lake.

23 MS. CHEEVER: So the lake goes -- the
24 groundwater underneath the tunnel would have been fed
25 into the lake.

1 MS. FANELLI: It would have been part of
2 the lake. Some portion of it would have.

3 MS. CHEEVER: I also have a question from
4 a neighbor. Some of pipe number four seems to be only
5 two and a half feet below the ground level, and would it
6 be possible to remove at least part of pipe number four,
7 like about eighty feet of it?

8 MS. FANELLI: Not under remediation, but
9 it could be a project that the Trust takes on at some
10 point in time.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Well, if people wanted to
12 remove one of the pipes, what part of the Trust or any
13 agency would be in charge of that?

14 MS. FANELLI: Well, it would be part of
15 our -- you know, the EA -- it would have to be evaluated.

16 MS. THOMAS: It would be very similar to
17 the Mountain Lake Enhancement Plan that we have that
18 included the east arm to restore.

19 But unfortunately, we didn't complete it.
20 So we'd need to look at -- now if the pipe were to be
21 taken out, what the hydrology is of that section and kind
22 of the thing that Mark was saying.

23 We might be able to do that now, like they
24 were saying, where the pipe ends and what kind of a
25 wetlands we want there in the future, but the actual

1 taking out of the additional pipe needs to be looked at
2 from a hydrologic standpoint and erosion. We just
3 haven't done any analysis.

4 MS. CHEEVER: If people want that, to whom
5 should they appeal?

6 MS. THOMAS: I --

7 MS. CHEEVER: To you?

8 MS. THOMAS: I don't know to who exactly.
9 I guess you write a letter to Michael and Craig. I mean,
10 I don't know. To the trust.

11 And I don't think it's something that we'd
12 at all be against. Everybody's kind of saying, "Shoot,
13 we wish that would be included at the same time," but it
14 doesn't have an environmental document. It doesn't apply
15 to CEQA, right?

16 MS. FANELLI: Well, it doesn't -- there's
17 not a remediation triggered to remove it. There's no
18 CERCLA issue associated with the pipe.

19 MR. BERMAN: It's just --

20 MS. CHEEVER: Isn't there at least an
21 argument about lowering the pipes that doesn't have
22 contamination in it?

23 MS. FANELLI: The Trust wouldn't accept
24 leaving a pipe that has contamination in there. We want
25 clean closure. It has to include clean closure, and at

1 this point, the assumption is Caltrans' proposal is they
2 can get clean closure without removing the pipe.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Somehow they'd
4 remove the sediment.

5 MS. FANELLI: Or sample it or test it or
6 determine if there's a problem there.

7 MS. CHEEVER: The lower pipe?

8 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

9 MS. CHEEVER: You're not talking about
10 capping it.

11 MS. FANELLI: No, document either by
12 cleaning it or sampling a document, and if there is any
13 lead contamination.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No one's sampled
15 the inside of the pipe, so you don't really know whether
16 there's lead contamination in there or not.

17 MS. COYLE: But the plan is ultimately to
18 fill it and abandon it, so that would occur regardless.

19 MS. FANELLI: But the Trust wouldn't
20 accept it if DTSC didn't think that was a clean closure,
21 right? That's the Trust's position.

22 MR. BERMAN: So who's in charge of
23 actually doing the sampling inside the -- that pipe five?

24 MS. FANELLI: Documenting that -- to the
25 satisfaction DTSC's satisfaction that it's clean closure

1 is Caltrans' responsibility.

2 MS. CHEEVER: But that is not part of
3 this --

4 MS. FANELLI: Right.

5 MS. CHEEVER: -- supplemental additional
6 sampling plan?

7 MS. FANELLI: Right.

8 MS. CHEEVER: It's a different thing.

9 MS. COYLE: This is just addressing the
10 sediment that would have already discharged out of pipe
11 and downstream, but then Caltrans is writing the plans
12 for the cleanout of the pipe and the abandonment as well
13 as sampling the sediments inside the pipe. So that's a
14 different plan that's forthcoming.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Is that a plan that is
16 subject to public comment?

17 MS. FANELLI: No, I don't think so.

18 MS. COYLE: It's a remedial design plan.

19 MS. FANELLI: It's a work plan,
20 essentially.

21 MS. CHEEVER: What you would say is part
22 of the basic Mountain Lake RAP or something?

23 MS. FANELLI: It's a work plan like our
24 RDIP. It doesn't go out for public review, although we
25 obviously share it with you.

1 DTSC would post it and if we have any say,
2 we'll let you know when it's submitted.

3 MR. BERMAN: But presumably it does have
4 to be approved by DTSC.

5 MS. FANELLI: It doesn't have to be
6 approved by DTSC. But it's not a formal thirty-day
7 public comment piece, just like the RDIP is not.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Well, while we have the
9 privilege of having Terri here from a different
10 department, right now there isn't a plan to do more with
11 the north arm than is required, is your department able
12 to be in touch about all these things that are happening?

13 MS. THOMAS: Yeah.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Like Mark's question, if
15 it's restoration of the stream habitat or restoration of
16 the wetlands habitat, does your department weigh in on
17 that since that's your expertise?

18 MS. THOMAS: We meet every couple weeks.

19 MR. TECZUN: We've met forty times on this
20 project.

21 MS. THOMAS: And yeah. I'm sure that once
22 they do the sampling and they know the -- the work that's
23 going to be done in there, they usually always check in
24 with us on vegetation work.

25 They usually contract with folks that do

1 some vegetation work, but we're always involved in that.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And I had a
3 clarification on one of Julie's questions. I looked at
4 the as-built Caltrans plan showing the former lake
5 boundary underneath and the -- you know, what they
6 actually filled in and you should look at that again
7 because it does not really go up the north arm like you
8 were just saying.

9 I mean, some of it does, partially, but
10 most of the fill -- most of the lake was under the
11 embankment of the roadway from what they're showing in
12 their plans.

13 The lake didn't really go up that north
14 Arm. That was a natural topographic Drainage.

15 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Look at the
17 topography. I'll send that to you tomorrow because I
18 actually snipped it out and made a copy of it.

19 Forty percent of the lake has been filled
20 and the whole north arm, I think that's kind of --

21 MR. TECZUN: Right here would give you an
22 indication where the lake was. This was filled in 1871.

23 MS. CHEEVER: So that was filled in 1971.

24 MR. TECZUN: 1871, except the roadway was
25 built in the 1930s.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It does show the
2 roadway. Most of it -- the roadway kind of goes up and
3 most of it's on that side of the road.

4 So this arm here is actually -- may not
5 have been lake in open waters. I'll send some of that
6 out because I snipped it out.

7 MR. TECZUN: It looks like the north arm
8 was shoreline at one point, right? Because the --
9 because the roadway embankment, that was the fill, and
10 you've got open water right here. This used to be
11 shoreline.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Um, yeah.

13 MR. TECZUN: If you look in there.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The lake's gone up
15 and down six feet. Which shoreline would you like?

16 This is just the as-built Caltrans plans
17 that shows the shoreline and shows what they built on top
18 of it. It's interesting.

19 MS. THOMAS: We have the 1871 topography
20 and even earlier. We have 1854 from the lake.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm not trying to
22 contradict. It may be a little exaggerated.

23 MS. COYLE: Send it along.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: To say that this is
25 open water at one time. Especially where the mouth of

1 the pipes are. I know that somewhere down there, it was
2 filled from embankment fill.

3 MR. BERMAN: That was once a beach, right,
4 of a sort, probably?

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Marsh.

6 MR. BERMAN: Where the Miwoks picnic,
7 right?

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Questions,
9 comments on sampling plan for the north arm of Mountain
10 Lake?

11 MR. BERMAN: You put a lot of work in
12 that, Mark.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It was interesting.
14 It was interesting. I started this whole thing,
15 basically, so it kind of feels like my baby.

16 It was interesting the other day to go back
17 and reread through all my comments and responsiveness
18 summary and everything, so -- you know, interesting.
19 We'll keep an eye on it, I guess.

20 MR. BERMAN: I think we learned a lot, but
21 we're gratified that you would actually go into that much
22 detail and look at that and discover those riparian
23 streams and --

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It was a fluke.
25 Other areas of the Presidio, especially with the Army,

1 they had written reports -- especially landfill 2, they
2 had written reports and it turned out no one had ever
3 gone in there.

4 So part of my claim to fame is I went into
5 the area where landfill 2 is and there was a drumstick
6 sticking out of the ground with a big gash sticking out
7 of it, the end of it.

8 The Army had never seen that. Until
9 someone goes in there and looks, there wasn't any samples
10 out there. I said, "Let's just walk through the marsh
11 and see what's there. And there's flowing water in the
12 middle of it. Either the pipe was broken or the pipe
13 wasn't there. One of the two cases." That led to the
14 whole thing.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Do any of you know if
16 Caltrans has a timeline in working on the pipes and
17 sampling them and cleaning them?

18 MS. COYLE: They would like to do it very
19 soon, probably in the next two or three months.

20 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. I know.

21 MS. COYLE: They're anxious to complete
22 the project.

23 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

24 MS. COYLE: And they have a draft plan in
25 the works now, so I expect that that will be issued

1 fairly soon to DTSC.

2 MR. BERMAN: Is there someone in DTSC
3 that's specifically assigned to work with Caltrans on
4 this project?

5 MS. FANELLI: Lori is the project manager
6 from Mountain Lake, so she's also the one taking charge
7 of that.

8 MR. BERMAN: So if you wanted to get
9 the -- the Caltrans plan, Lori would probably be the
10 person that would have it, the first shot at it.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
12 comments, questions?

13 Moving on, new business, RAB final report.
14 Well, Jan Monaghan was kind of going to report back to us
15 on that and she couldn't be here and didn't give me
16 anything.

17 Does anybody else have any information in
18 the RAB final report?

19 MR. BERMAN: Doug volunteered to do some
20 writing on that.

21 Is that just fantasy?

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I never got
23 anything from Doug, either. I'm recommending we table
24 this till next month.

25 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Find out more
2 what's going on.

3 Action items and agenda items. I can
4 always use help with coming up with agenda items for the
5 next meeting.

6 Anybody have any suggestions?

7 MR. BERMAN: That will be a bunch of
8 constructions that are imminent, right? So --

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Progress reports.

10 MR. BERMAN: Progress report, and of
11 course there is -- deciding whether there were any
12 prehistoric animals about Mountain Lake.

13 MS. CHEEVER: Would a sampling be done of
14 Mountain Lake.

15 MR. TECZUN: We don't have approvals to
16 have it.

17 MS. COYLE: I'm expecting it here shortly,
18 but my hope it would be done within a month.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Maybe we can have an update
20 on Mountain Lake or the north arm.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. If you have
22 any other ideas, send them to me.

23 MR. CHESTER: Isn't there another tour to
24 the public?

25 MS. FANELLI: There's general public ones.

1 MS. COYLE: There's two meetings scheduled
2 be, one on the 23rd of May. That's a Thursday afternoon
3 at 4:30. There's one Saturday the 25th of May at 10:00
4 a.M, but the general public ones, we're not going to --
5 you guys got the -- a VIP treatment today.

6 They're not going to go back into the
7 material handling area. We're not going to be putting
8 hard hats and safety vests on the public.

9 It's going to be sticking to the trail.
10 Definitely there's not as much to see as you guys.

11 MS. FANELLI: It's going to be dual
12 purpose. The east arm is probably more of the focus of
13 those than the remediation.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
15 comments? Announcements.

16 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

17 (The meeting concluded at 8:56 PM).

18 ---o0o---

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2013

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

Page 1

1

ATTENDEES

2

RAB Members:

3

Mark Youngkin, Facilitator (Not present)

Eileen Fanelli

4

Brian Ullensvang

Julie Cheever

5

Edward Callanan

Jan Monaghan

6

Jan Blum

Sara Segal

7

Edward Callanan

8

---o0o---

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

16

of the Meeting, and on January 10, 2013, 7:10 PM at

17

Building 67, Presidio of San Francisco, California,

18

before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of

19

California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the

20

provisions of the Presidio Trust.

21

---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Jan Monaghan:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements:	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations:	
7	A. Mountain Lake Construction	4
8	B. North Arm Sediment Sampling	14
9	C. Other projects underway	29
10	5) New Business:	
11	A. RAB Final Report Planning	44
12	6) Public Comment - None	
13	7) Action Items and Agenda Items:	58
14	8) Closing:	60

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MS. MONAGHAN: So let's start. Shall we?
2 So welcome to the Restoration Advisory Board for the
3 Presidio for June 2013. Wow! Welcome, everybody. It's
4 so funny.

5 Everybody approve the agenda for tonight?

6 MS. BLUM: Yes.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: And I don't think there's
8 any announcements other than this class. It's going to
9 be the first weekend in July about Mountain Lake
10 underground by the archeology department.

11 MS. BLUM: Oh, really? How interesting.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: If you want to see that.
13 That's the only announcement I know of.

14 I guess you're going to give us an update
15 on the construction.

16 MS. FANELLI: I apologize for the agenda,
17 but Denise Fraga has jumped to a different department at
18 the Trust, so I have a temp, but things are not going to
19 be the same. I can guarantee you that.

20 Denise helps us out, but she's actually
21 over in 1750, but we're thrilled because our history --
22 obviously our future, I should say, is going to be in
23 transition just like everything else as we complete the
24 remediation program.

25 So I'm really thrilled and encouraged that

1 she jumped into a department that's got a permanent long-
2 term position.

3 So she's still helping us out, but my
4 clerk -- my temp may never -- will probably never rise to
5 the same level of understanding and knowledge as Denise
6 had. So that's just an announcement there.

7 And her name is Natalie Varnay. So you may
8 see an N. Varnay. I'm trying to encourage her to get
9 with the groove and e-mail stuff.

10 MS. BLUM: V-a-r-n-e-y?

11 MS. FANELLI: V-a-r-n-a-y.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

13 MS. FANELLI: And it's okay if you slip up
14 and e-mail to Denise Fraga, because she would forward it.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: She went to ops?

16 MS. FANELLI: Yes. She's in the
17 operations department. I actually don't even know in my
18 head exactly who she's serving over there, but she's in
19 1750.

20 It's very easy for her because she lives in
21 the Baker Beach Apartments, so she can walk to work,
22 essentially.

23 MS. SEGAL: Where we used to have our
24 meetings.

25 MS. FANELLI: Where we used to a long time

1 ago.

2 MS. MONAGHAN: So we are doing dredging,
3 right?

4 MS. FANELLI: So we're moving on to -- I
5 don't want to be too monologuy. Ask questions as we go
6 along here. I know you all went on the -- many -- how
7 many went on the tour?

8 MS. MONAGHAN: I was gone.

9 MS. BLUM: Oh, that was a great tour. In
10 the back forty --

11 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

12 MS. BLUM: -- with the guys.

13 MS. FANELLI: It was very -- it was a
14 great tour.

15 MS. BLUM: Yeah.

16 MS. FANELLI: And we can probably do it
17 again if we need to. That project is going along line.

18 If you get a chance to walk down there,
19 you'll see the materials handling area or the laydown
20 area with some very big bags of dirt dewatering.

21 So they are making continuous progress and
22 we're, I believe, planning to continue with the current
23 phase of excavation, dredging through the end of the
24 month, and then we will have a period of continued dry-
25 out and in July hopefully off-haul the sediment that

1 we've got so far.

2 And then there'll be a second phase of
3 dredging where they'll lay out the tubes again and fill
4 the bags with the sediment and do the treatment and
5 discharge it.

6 MS. BLUM: When is the second phase going
7 to start? October?

8 MS. FANELLI: August.

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MS. SEGAL: I haven't been down there.
11 Are the paths still open?

12 MS. FANELLI: The walkways are always open
13 unless we're doing something special and hauling
14 equipment. So they are open for the most part.

15 MS. SEGAL: They'll mostly be open?

16 MS. FANELLI: Yes. When we do the
17 hauling, they'll obviously be closed at that point. But
18 for the most part, they're open right now.

19 There's been a lot of outreach. There's
20 been several public walks. We had a whole series of
21 special walks. The RAB came on one.

22 We had some technical folks coming out, the
23 engineering types that were interested in some of the
24 details of the treatment system.

25 We had our Trust Management come out and

1 take a look at it, so we had the attorneys from the
2 Department of Justice come out to take a look at it.
3 That was kind of a fun afternoon.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: It started about five years
5 ago, right?

6 MS. FANELLI: So they got to see the
7 physical fruits of their labor.

8 MS. SEGAL: With the sediments showing
9 what we expected?

10 MS. FANELLI: They're behaving pretty much
11 the way we expected them to behave. They're dewatering I
12 think pretty much on schedule.

13 That's going to be the big reveal is if
14 these bags really do dewater as quickly as we hope that
15 they are going to.

16 We have a contingency. When we break them
17 open, if they're too wet to add something like -- I want
18 to say flash, but they're going to add like a cement or
19 something --

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: Lyme.

21 MS. FANELLI: -- to solidify it.

22 We don't want to do that, because it goes
23 by weight, but it's extra material to handle, but we'll
24 see how they conform. But so far, so good.

25 MS. BLUM: When you say they are behaving

1 pretty much as you expected, what were some of the
2 unexpected situations, if any?

3 MS. FANELLI: There's not too many
4 unexpected. We get a little bit of iron precipitation
5 out when sediments come up.

6 They're coming from a more anoxic, low DO,
7 oxygen environment. You bring them up and you get a
8 little oxide, rust. You get a little.

9 What that will do is it clogs the filter
10 essentially. So they have to do extra pushing or beating
11 on the bags. That was one thing that we found.

12 They found a few tires and other debris.
13 They've been digging that out. Not a significant amount
14 of debris, but a few things, garbage they had to dig out.
15 So really nothing majorly unexpected.

16 MS. BLUM: Okay.

17 MS. FANELLI: Always the same normal
18 challenges. We get a lot of systems in operation.

19 The treatment processing 24/7, because the
20 bags are always losing water 24/7, but our laydown area
21 is limited in size.

22 So we actually have to stop dredging
23 sometimes because we have to wait for the -- so the
24 dredging is throttled down to a low level and it's the
25 dewatering process that's driving the schedule.

1 MS. SEGAL: Can the public see the laydown
2 area?

3 MS. FANELLI: You can see it from the
4 fence. Yes, you sure can. I think right now it's pretty
5 impressive, because they have at least two layers of the
6 bag stacked. So they're going to be more than ten feet
7 tall.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Are they going to go to
9 three at some point?

10 MS. FANELLI: They may go to three.
11 There's always those stability issues, so they're
12 watching them and trying to make some decisions about
13 whether to go to three on this round or gamble and go to
14 three on the second round. We'll see how that goes.

15 We did do preconfirmation sampling in the
16 lake. So that is one way that we're controlling
17 schedule, and that has been good.

18 So when we did that preconfirmation
19 sampling, we did find a small area in the bottom of the
20 lake where we're going to go a little deeper than
21 planned, but it's sort of within our contingency
22 estimate.

23 So we're going to take up maybe 1,800 yards
24 more than what the RAP said, which was approximately
25 1,500 -- 50,000 and six yards.

1 So say we're going to take about 18,000
2 yards now. But the good thing about that is now we are
3 going to a defined bottom.

4 So we don't have to do those confirmation
5 samples anymore, and it also means that we have less
6 regrading on the bottom of the lake to do.

7 MS. SEGAL: Okay. So 18,000 yards.

8 MS. FANELLI: About 18,000 yards. It
9 means that we have less contouring on the bottom, because
10 we're going to be cutting a more uniform bottom surface.

11 Pluses. Things that are keeping us on
12 schedule, and what's really driving the schedule is we
13 want to be able to take apart -- to restore the materials
14 handling area before we get into the rainy season
15 essentially.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: It won't dry out very much
17 in rainy season.

18 MS. FANELLI: Well, in the rainy season,
19 you know, the bags are not affected by the rain.

20 MS. SEGAL: Can you just show or explain
21 on the map where the materials handling area is?

22 MS. FANELLI: This is the materials
23 handling area.

24 MS. SEGAL: Okay. All right.

25 MS. FANELLI: So the barge -- the barge is

1 moving. The pipe from the barge comes up here, goes
2 along the trail.

3 It's cut underneath the trail, goes all the
4 way up the side into a series of manifolds up here that
5 fill the bags.

6 MS. SEGAL: Okay. Cool.

7 MS. FANELLI: Then the water comes to a
8 treatment system here and goes through a series of
9 filters. The pipe goes -- dumps it directly back there.

10 MS. SEGAL: Thank you.

11 MS. BLUM: Very nice display items, I must
12 say. The triangles and the squares, very good.

13 MS. FANELLI: Well, they're magnets.
14 Whatever was in the catalog that was available.

15 So we're still on our basic schedule for
16 Mountain Lake that we historically publish. We -- we are
17 not going to finish any time earlier than what we
18 originally had shown, and I expect that we'll be still in
19 the water.

20 And hopefully getting out of the water in
21 October, and hauling off the final sediment sometime in
22 late September, early October, and then fixing the
23 laydown area.

24 We will see.

25 I know that Natural Resources is planning

1 to do tree removals in the east arm, as well. So it's
2 not a remediation project, but we're obviously
3 coordinating with them to allow that to happen, and
4 that's so they can build some additional wetland area in
5 that east arm.

6 So I know there's been outreach on that at
7 some of the public walks and meetings, but it's a -- this
8 season is significant tree removal project that they'll
9 be doing.

10 MS. BLUM: And that's going to occur late
11 September, October?

12 MS. FANELLI: Yes. That's the plan.

13 MS. BLUM: Okay.

14 MS. FANELLI: It may start in August.
15 We're working on that coordination.

16 MS. BLUM: Okay.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: They don't have to wait
18 until we're done, right?

19 MS. FANELLI: They don't. Their work is
20 up in here.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

22 MS. FANELLI: The issue is how they get
23 their trees out, and using the common route is the
24 coordination issue.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

1 MS. FANELLI: Physically they could do a
2 lot of work here and we'd never be in each other's way.
3 Typically their hauling and our hauling becomes a
4 problem. So that's what we're trying to coordinate.

5 And then I believe they will be doing
6 grading in the east arm, but they won't be doing that
7 until 2014. And we should be gone by then.

8 I see that north arm sampling is on the
9 agenda. We did collect additional sediment samples. I
10 know that we have gotten the data back.

11 I don't believe we've packaged it yet to
12 submit to DTSC, although we have probably presented it to
13 them informally. I'm sure. Genevieve has talked to Lori
14 about it.

15 But we have found a defined area of high
16 lead, so it does like it's the sediments that were
17 transported by the pipelines, and it's all downstream of
18 the pipelines.

19 Not the upper pipe so much, but the lower
20 pipe, and we are working on removal plan, how we're going
21 to get that out of there.

22 It looks like it's a little slightly large
23 volume for hand work, so we're trying to figure out
24 access, you know, for minimal damage, et cetera to the
25 habitat up there.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Can you show on the map
2 where it is?

3 MS. FANELLI: It's mainly down in this
4 lower portion here. There's a discharge here where we
5 see some.

6 It's sort of like -- I think the pipe maybe
7 ends up here, and there's a little bit of contamination
8 some downstream of this and then it kind of cleans up as
9 we go down.

10 But it's pretty much in the channel. It's
11 not -- so there will be some removal there.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Do you have an estimate of
13 where?

14 MS. FANELLI: No, not at this point. We
15 have the data back that defines the extent. It's limited
16 to the channel. It can go fairly deep into the sediments
17 in the channel, I think four feet or so, and we're
18 writing that up and coming up with the way to clean it
19 out.

20 MS. CHEEVER: Once you remove it, would
21 that change whether there is free flowing water or
22 marshland in that area?

23 I mean, is it significant enough that it
24 would change what that is or what the expands the area of
25 the lake?

1 MS. FANELLI: No. It would remain a
2 wetland, and we wouldn't bring in soil if we could get it
3 to function as it did before.

4 We'd bring back in minimal amount of soil.
5 We'd bring only enough back really for erosion and to
6 make sure we don't have scour, but we wouldn't bring in
7 excess to necessarily bring it back up to current grade.

8 MS. CHEEVER: If it expanded the lake,
9 that wouldn't be a bad thing anyhow, would it?

10 MS. FANELLI: It won't expand the lake.
11 It's not that much water or sediment that's being
12 removed.

13 I think the goal would be to remove that
14 sediment because it's filled in, anyway. It's been
15 deposited from the pipelines, and have it be an open
16 channel flow to the extent we can without scour, without
17 bringing back in more dirt to fill it up.

18 So we will be leaving it open so that it
19 begins to approximate sort of a free-flowing channel. I
20 don't think the removal will be enough to see any kind of
21 backup of the lake into that area.

22 MS. BLUM: Can you point out the areas
23 where the natural spring is the strongest in Mountain
24 Lake, where the natural source of water? Is that the
25 right way to put it? The strength bed, where are the

1 primary location of these springs?

2 MS. FANELLI: It's mainly groundwater fed.

3 MS. BLUM: I thought there was actually
4 spring.

5 MS. FANELLI: The lake is primarily
6 groundwater fed, and fluctuations are from storm water
7 and other surface water discharges.

8 MS. BLUM: So is one more prone to push
9 groundwater through than another or do we even know that?

10 MS. FANELLI: I don't believe so. I think
11 in general, we just installed some additional wells
12 surrounding the lake to look at groundwater elevation,
13 and basically groundwater appears to be moving this
14 direction, and Caltrans is going to be putting in some
15 more wells here so we can define that a little bit
16 better.

17 Essentially you have a constant groundwater
18 inflow on one side and out the other.

19 MS. BLUM: And that is not necessarily as
20 a result of the height of the golfcourse, is it, or is
21 it?

22 MS. FANELLI: Well, the groundwater flow
23 is --

24 MS. BLUM: It probably is, and the
25 golfcourse would fit into that?

1 MS. FANELLI: There's a gradient. To the
2 extent there's recharge up here and you have a higher
3 gradient from the lake. The hydraulic conductivity, the
4 rate of discharge into the lake.

5 MS. BLUM: And the golfcourse is not a
6 toxic additive anymore to Mountain Lake? Or it is --

7 MS. FANELLI: Based on -- the Natural
8 Resource Department works and does more work in terms of
9 monitoring water quality coming out of the golfcourse and
10 locations.

11 I know that since when the Park Service was
12 managing the area, they started implementing significant
13 changes in how the area was landscaped, and that
14 landscape was maintained using both fertilizers and
15 pesticides and things like that.

16 I do know that the -- the plans for the
17 golfcourse are probably posted or available, but they are
18 updated every -- every year.

19 They have an annual plan and their goal is
20 obviously not to impact water quality.

21 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

22 MS. FANELLI: So I don't really have
23 detailed information in terms of the condensation of
24 nutrients or others that may be coming off of the
25 golfcourse, but I know it's monitored.

1 MS. BLUM: Really not your department.

2 MS. FANELLI: Not at this point.

3 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

4 MS. FANELLI: Not at this point. It's
5 not. It may never be. We're looking at water flow in
6 that area with Caltrans for the future diversion and
7 overflow project. The diversion.

8 MS. BLUM: Okay.

9 MS. FANELLI: When Caltrans does their
10 permanent fix to take discharge from Highway 1 off of
11 the -- out of the lake and put it into the overflow pipe.

12 So there's been some initial modeling by
13 Caltrans, and we install those wells to help provide
14 information, to help us understand what's going on.

15 So there were several installed, and
16 Natural Resources also installed some additional ones
17 recently in the park here.

18 So we now will have a nice set of
19 monitoring wells surrounding essentially the lake, some
20 by Caltrans, some by the overflow project and some
21 additional ones by Natural Resources to try to get a good
22 handle on the whole hydraulics.

23 But it's primarily groundwater, and surface
24 water when it rains or however it comes in also
25 influences and is mainly responsible for the fluctuations

1 in the water level.

2 And right now, the underdrain from
3 MacArthur Tunnel that comes from the north arm is a
4 continuous source of water.

5 It's about twenty plus gallons per minute,
6 maybe as high as forty gallons per minute that comes into
7 the lake, but it is coming from the tunnel.

8 So when you get to the tunnel, and outside
9 of the tunnel, there's a French drain to keep water from
10 getting into the tunnel, and there's a pipe that connects
11 that water and brings it into the lake.

12 MS. BLUM: Wow.

13 MS. CHEEVER: Where does that water come
14 from?

15 MS. FANELLI: It comes from groundwater.
16 It's groundwater.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: The lake's a big circle.

18 MS. BLUM: Yeah. Down here.

19 MS. FANELLI: I could try to draw you -- I
20 have to stand behind Mark. Here's a little picture of
21 what's kind of going on in a very simplistic manner.

22 Now I don't consider myself -- I am a
23 hydrogeologist by training, that is my technical
24 background, but as you know, I don't do a lot of
25 technical work anymore. I just manage processes and

1 worry about schedules and budgets.

2 If this is -- let's see. Mountain Lake --
3 I can't reach over. So there's a water level. It should
4 be blue. It shouldn't be orange, but, you know,
5 essentially you have a groundwater gradient. So this is
6 going up, and that's our golfcourse.

7 You're going to have a groundwater gradient
8 that, you know, parallels -- the assumption is it
9 parallels the ground surface.

10 So you're going to have flow that's coming
11 into the lake this way, but it's also going to go out to
12 the lake this way, particularly if this is the downward
13 gradient.

14 So you're going to see an exchange, and
15 then this fluctuation will change.

16 I wouldn't expect over -- if there were no
17 surface water input and there was no evapotranspiration,
18 you wouldn't see this fluctuate that much, but we do see
19 it fluctuate about four, four and a half feet over time,
20 and that's mainly being driven by the storm water and the
21 groundwater imports.

22 MS. SEGAL: So is there any water that's
23 going to come off the highway anymore?

24 MS. FANELLI: In the future, no.

25 MS. SEGAL: Right now, it does?

1 MS. FANELLI: Still does. But Caltrans
2 has inserted into eighteen different drop inlet
3 structures little treatment units.

4 So now all of the water that goes through
5 those drop inlets from the highway, before it goes into
6 the lake is filtered essentially.

7 MS. SEGAL: Is it lead the area of
8 concern?

9 MS. FANELLI: I don't think it's lead
10 anymore.

11 MS. SEGAL: Oils.

12 MS. FANELLI: Oils certainly, and other
13 materials and metals associated with the cars and brakes
14 and things like that.

15 MS. SEGAL: How many did Caltrans put in?
16 Eighteen?

17 MS. FANELLI: Eighteen.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Where are all these drop
19 inlets? Along the highway?

20 MS. FANELLI: Along the highway.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Is the information that you
22 said is sort of being put together, is that going to be
23 made available at some point?

24 MS. FANELLI: Yes. Because the whole --
25 they can't implement the diversion project until there's

1 another public CEQA document.

2 MS. CHEEVER: I'm talking about the north
3 arm only.

4 MS. FANELLI: No.

5 MS. CHEEVER: The information is being
6 packaged?

7 MS. FANELLI: It's being packaged. When
8 we get ready to get that to DTSC for review, we'll get a
9 copy for you to look at definitely.

10 MS. CHEEVER: So you were answering a
11 different question.

12 MS. FANELLI: There won't be any more
13 public review on the solution for the north arm. That
14 won't happen.

15 The -- the other project, the diversion
16 overflow project is a separate project and it has to go
17 through the CEQA, NEPA process, and the Trust is working
18 with Caltrans to figure out how to do that jointly.

19 But it's really just getting started, to be
20 perfectly honest with you. There's a whole bunch of
21 planning and up-front discussions with stakeholders that
22 hasn't even happened yet that has to happen, so --

23 MS. SEGAL: Who operates the golfcourse?
24 Is that -- it's an operating golfcourse, right?

25 MS. FANELLI: It's an operating

1 golfcourse. The Trust is -- we have a concessionaire
2 that's I think managing it for us. I forget the name of
3 the company that's doing it.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: Palmer.

5 MS. FANELLI: It's not Palmer anymore.

6 MS. SEGAL: But there's not a concern
7 about drainage from the golf course into the lake, right?

8 MS. FANELLI: Not -- that's a question --
9 the Natural Resources Department is doing a water quality
10 monitoring and they're looking specifically -- and they
11 work through the Trust as a whole with the golfcourse.

12 It happens all the time. I just don't know
13 the details of it.

14 I don't think there's a real significant
15 concern, but there's always concern. Certainly we know
16 that -- I know that I've heard from Terri's group there's
17 a lot of nutrients in the lake.

18 I know there's a look at what the biggest
19 bang for their buck is.

20 MS. SEGAL: I lost alphabet language from
21 the government, but the integrated management.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: That was ten years ago.

23 MS. FANELLI: They do an annual report of
24 their practices and I know their plan is updated.

25 MS. CHEEVER: One more question about the

1 north arm. What is the estimated time of when the
2 removal will take place?

3 MS. FANELLI: It would happen before we're
4 gone. So obviously it would happen -- probably at the
5 same time as the dredging, and it's not clear if we could
6 use -- if we could do some of it with the dredging
7 equipment or if we have to have a different access in
8 there to get the material out. But it would be part of
9 remediation.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: Certainly before October.

11 MS. FANELLI: It would be before October.

12 MS. BLUM: Eileen, I know we just
13 discussed this. It's not your responsibility what
14 happens with natural resources in the lake, but I think
15 it would be very beneficial to all of us that are
16 interested in Mountain Lake to hear how well natural
17 resources is -- or what they're doing to control the
18 infiltration of these nutrients that that are being used
19 on the golf course.

20 I think it's relevant to this conversation.
21 We're spending -- I don't know -- over ten million
22 dollars cleaning up Mountain Lake.

23 It would be nice to know that we're not
24 continuing polluting it and we're actually reducing the
25 pollution from the other side.

1 I think it would be a very important piece
2 for the public to know that it's going to actually be
3 cleaned up when it's clean, not just one department, but
4 all departments.

5 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. Certainly I didn't
6 mean to indicate that somehow we're not paying attention
7 to it.

8 MS. BLUM: No, no. I wasn't implying
9 that, either, but it might be good to have that report.
10 Maybe Terri could bring a report --

11 MS. FANELLI: Sure.

12 MS. BLUM: -- to our next meeting.

13 MS. FANELLI: If you guys want to hear
14 from Terri about the natural resources stuff.

15 MS. BLUM: If it's okay, I'll contact her
16 to ask her to show up at the next meeting.

17 MS. FANELLI: Sure. I don't know her
18 schedule, but I know if you ask her to come, she's always
19 happy to come.

20 The remediation -- some of the things that
21 we said during the public walks, there's a side benefit
22 to remediation; not only removing the motor oil and the
23 lead of the sediment, but we're also taking out a lot of
24 the organic loading on the lake, which is really going to
25 help in the short term, I think, improve water quality.

1 Because we're kind of taking out a lot of
2 the organic that uses up oxygen, and as it degrades and
3 helps to make the -- dissolve oxygen lower in the lake.
4 We're taking some of that biological oxygen demand out.

5 Obviously when they did earlier work well
6 before my time, and maybe it was the -- was it the Trust
7 took out the trees -- like in the early 2000s along the
8 east arm.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

10 MS. FANELLI: That did a lot from what I
11 understand, talking to Michael Boland and looking at
12 pictures to stop the loading of the organic material into
13 the lake.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: There were a lot of
15 leaves dropping in the lake.

16 MS. SEGAL: We might actually have a fish
17 fry from Mountain Lake one day.

18 MS. FANELLI: I know that over time, it's
19 much better today than it was back in the Army days, and
20 even remediation will -- besides getting out the lead and
21 the motor oil, will result in a lot cleaner bottom
22 because we'll take a lot of that old biological gunk out
23 of there.

24 And then when they do the north arm work
25 and some of their other fish -- they're proposing to

1 continue to eradicate the non-native fish and critters in
2 the lake and they get their plants planted, it should go
3 a long way to improve the water quality.

4 MS. SEGAL: On the package plans and
5 whatever Caltrans is going to call them, they're
6 responsible for maintenance?

7 MS. FANELLI: They are.

8 MS. SEGAL: Does anyone ever get back to
9 you guys?

10 MS. FANELLI: Yes, there is. They
11 actually have given us a maintenance plan and we check
12 with them along the way.

13 And because they've still been out there,
14 and if you saw the slope, the west slope after they were
15 done, we planted the larger trees, so 25 shore pine that
16 were purchased at Peter's request from Canada.

17 Caltrans essentially -- it was a quid pro
18 quo, but Caltrans essentially bought the trees to plant
19 there, and -- but we did it through an exchange because
20 we paid for something they had to do that was the same
21 amount. But we're working with each other.

22 Peter's group has put in a little bit of
23 temporary irrigation along there, and also in the very
24 steep areas where the trees were planted, we just
25 finished planting some shorter and smaller stalks, which

1 will grow up.

2 So I think it's in the -- in the next year
3 or two, it's going to look very nice there.

4 I know Brian Hildebeidle has been out there
5 putting in some willow clippings and cuttings, getting
6 some plants on that western slope.

7 It should be growing and looking better
8 than ever in the next year or two.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: I'm ready.

10 MS. FANELLI: So Mountain Lake's ongoing,
11 and we do talk. We meet with Caltrans almost weekly.
12 There's not a week that goes by that I don't talk to them
13 on something and Genevieve talks to them more often as
14 the project manager on Mountain Lake. There's a lot of
15 close contact.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: So other projects?

17 MS. FANELLI: So other projects. We are
18 going -- you're going to be fencing -- Thursday Monday
19 morning up at the Baker Beach 1A site. So
20 we're -- I think they had some crews out there today
21 actually doing some initial survey work, and they might
22 be doing that again tomorrow.

23 But then their -- the fencing contractor is
24 showing up on Thursday morning.

25 We had PICs out there.

1 MS. BLUM: TICs?

2 MR. FANELLI: PICs, project information
3 coordinators.

4 MS. BLUM: Thank you.

5 MS. FANELLI: The same folks that have
6 been wandering around Mountain Lake, but we think the
7 fence is going to take about four days to get up, and
8 they are working Saturdays.

9 I don't know if the fencing contractor is
10 working this Saturday, but the work schedule is a six-day
11 work week right now.

12 So that's -- that's kicking off. So we
13 should start seeing some real action there.

14 MS. BLUM: BB1 near Merchant Road?

15 MS. FANELLI: We're fencing off the
16 Merchant Road parking lot.

17 MS. BLUM: All right.

18 MS. FANELLI: And I believe that they will
19 be doing some survey and some sampling and getting their
20 sites set up, and the bridge -- the temporary bridge
21 launch will be -- is currently scheduled for -- I want to
22 say the 28th. It's towards the end of the month, and
23 that's a few day proces, as well.

24 And once that's up, I imagine they will be
25 moving fairly quickly to get the bad stuff out and then

1 get the site rebuilt.

2 In that site, we have also done preliminary
3 preconfirmation sampling. We have done basically the
4 limits of excavation in a lateral sense, but we haven't
5 sampled that yet.

6 So we'll still have to do our depth
7 sampling to confirm that we got everything.

8 At this point, we're going to go as quickly
9 as we can, but I'm not going to predict that the site
10 will be available before October, because there's always
11 something that pops up, and I know that we're working --
12 Brian with the Park Service about trying to get a surface
13 on that trail so that it's walkable after we've gone, et
14 cetera.

15 So that it can be used by the public safely
16 after we're done.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Very popular spot.

18 MS. FANELLI: It is. A lot of folks
19 there. I heard today from Ken that -- our construction
20 manager is a guy named Ken Kievet. He's with Wu
21 Associates and apparently it was a sunny day and it
22 wasn't that windy, so there were a lot of folks out
23 there.

24 We are kicking you off Baker Beach 2
25 tomorrow. Our contractor there is ERRG, who's very

1 familiar with obviously working in the Presidio, and we
2 have got a commitment from them to begin their fencing
3 and mold the week of July 8.

4 We think it's going to take a few weeks to
5 get all their submittals in and then the holiday. So we
6 expect July 8th to be setting up a fence there.

7 So those are our big construction projects.

8 Barnard Avenue Protected Range is still out
9 to bid. I believe the bids are due this Friday. It's
10 certainly a smaller project, but we're anticipating that
11 it will be three to four weeks, and we hopefully will be
12 getting that done.

13 I don't think that will be noticed because
14 Mountain Lake will still be ongoing and the two Baker
15 Beaches will happen. That was going to happen tucked
16 away back here.

17 It's moving about 1,500 yards of material.
18 The backfill is in the dust bowl, so it should be a
19 fairly local exercise.

20 We will not be working six days a week.
21 They will be back to re -- trying to respect our tenants
22 as best we can, not starting before 8:00 and ending at
23 5:00 o'clock Monday through Friday.

24 So those will be our major construction
25 projects.

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Good one.

2 MS. BLUM: It sounds like your schedule is
3 a little less hectic than it has been in the past year.

4 MS. FANELLI: You know, we've had more
5 construction going on this past year than we probably
6 have had historically, but we've worked really hard at
7 developing a plan and getting our plan in place.

8 So now we're working the plan, and to the
9 extent that it is a plan that we're working, we can
10 anticipate the next steps, that does help relieve a
11 little bit of the stress.

12 But quite frankly, I'm -- I will not be
13 happy until we're done and it's the end of September and
14 I have a good sense that we're going to be buttoned up.

15 MS. BLUM: So are you still very
16 optimistic that you will reach the end of the line on
17 remediation in the time that has been allocated one way
18 or another?

19 MS. FANELLI: That's right. I am. I am.
20 The only other document that's a decision
21 document that will likely be issued is fillsite 6B.

22 MS. BLUM: Oh.

23 MS. FANELLI: And there we have been doing
24 additional sampling. That site has always been -- the
25 proposed remedy there has always been a land use control.

1 So we are going to have a land use control
2 to the extent we're doing additional risk analysis now,
3 and we're looking at it.

4 I described it last month. The area that's
5 sort of developed and will stay developed. It's the
6 Letterman complex.

7 We'll have one sort of land use control,
8 and the area that's the future marsh will have a
9 different set of land use controls and will be
10 accompanied by a soil management plan.

11 There will be some type of public process
12 associated with that decision document according to DTSC,
13 and I know I've pushing my team and I'm going to ask DTSC
14 when we next meet at the end of the month again to work
15 backwards just to make sure that we hit whatever that
16 public process is in the September/October timeframe so
17 we completely avoid the holiday time and some of those
18 stressors of trying to get things done around the
19 holidays.

20 So that is a key document that will be
21 coming out, and it's probably the last real decision
22 document that I think will be issued for the set of
23 enumerated sites that we know and love that were listed
24 in the original consent agreement and all that kind of
25 stuff.

1 MS. MONAGHAN: There's always more,
2 though.

3 MS. FANELLI: There's always things that
4 are found. There's provisions for that, but essentially
5 the goal --

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

7 MS. FANELLI: -- is to do the bulk of the
8 work that are identified in both the Water Board order
9 and the consent agreement.

10 And there's a tail. There's a tail of
11 documents. DTSC owes us a fair number of site
12 certifications for old stuff, and we still have documents
13 to get to them.

14 But I think the heavy documents, the big
15 items, we have that plan we're working at, and we're
16 checking it to make sure we don't have too many loose
17 ends.

18 For example, here's a loose end. I'm not
19 sure it's a loose end, but I'll a little bit of surprise.

20 We basically closed all the tanks. There's
21 tanks that we couldn't find. We did look for them in a
22 serious manner.

23 We found one -- we didn't find one, but the
24 Doyle contractor found one, because it usually takes an
25 excavator to find a tank.

1 So we found what we think is 205.1, it's a
2 very small tank. It's probably a couple hundred gallons.
3 Not a big issue, not a big issue. We find little things
4 like that.

5 So we're working on making sure that we
6 have plans in place for some of those inevitable things
7 that will happen.

8 MS. SEGAL: So who pays for the Doyle
9 contractor finding it? How does that work?

10 MS. FANELLI: Doyle's actually paid. It
11 is an enumerated tank. We did go out there and grab some
12 samples and we did our report to Agnes. In that case, it
13 was sort of a shared effort.

14 MS. SEGAL: When you say you're waiting
15 for some certifications still from DTSC, is the budget
16 flow, the accounting of the budget waiting for
17 certification?

18 MS. FANELLI: My budget?

19 MS. SEGAL: Mm-hmm.

20 MS. FANELLI: It only affects my budget to
21 the extent that DTSC bills me for all of their time.
22 That does affect us.

23 MS. SEGAL: They still haven't billed our
24 department.

25 MS. FANELLI: Or they're billing and not

1 giving me certifications, which is more problematic.

2 MS. SEGAL: Okay.

3 MS. FANELLI: For the most part, DTSC has
4 closed several sites and we're waiting on some of the
5 older sites, that we've submitted site certs and we
6 haven't heard.

7 We have made -- we have noted the concern
8 about that situation to DTSC and DTSC's trying to move --
9 handle it.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Do you think some things are
11 sort of lost?

12 MS. FANELLI: I think some project
13 managers at DTSC are better organized and move things
14 along than some of the other ones. Most of the sites
15 that we don't have closure on are Bob Boggs' old sites.

16 I can't imagine he doesn't have the
17 documents, but they're somewhere, and so I know that
18 they're working on pulling them all together.

19 MS. BLUM: We haven't seen the face of the
20 Water Board in probably a year now. So I'm wondering if
21 they're really actively engaged with this process or
22 we're just sort of in a second tier clerical queue.

23 MS. FANELLI: No. They're actively
24 engaged in it. Agnes is closing sites. She still has a
25 backlog. She has the FDS lines sometime closing. She

1 still has some of the big groups of tanks to close.

2 207/231 we've been working with her on. I
3 have the construction completion report to get out to
4 her, and she has been involved on Mountain Lake.

5 She worked very closely with Lori on a lot
6 of the treatability studies.

7 MS. BLUM: Lori from DTSC?

8 MS. FANELLI: Yes. On the Mountain Lake
9 project, but our workload probably doesn't represent the
10 lion's share of her day-to-day work anymore.

11 MS. BLUM: I think I raised my concern
12 because of the high interest in the environmental
13 community on the forthcoming connection to Tennessee
14 Hollow at Thompso -- not Thompson's Reach. Quartermaster
15 Reach, and the 6B --

16 MS. FANELLI: Well, fillsite 6B --

17 MS. BLUM: -- the compromise there we have
18 with the pollution.

19 MS. FANELLI: I'm not sure I understand
20 compromise.

21 MS. BLUM: Well, there is the old fill and
22 the new fill and the toxic material and all of that.

23 MS. FANELLI: 6B is just the Letterman
24 debris, and there is old fill underneath a portion of 6B,
25 but then old fill is pretty much everywhere down there in

1 the Crissy area.

2 But DTSC has asked us to assess old fill as
3 an unknown site in the area where it's -- overlapping
4 with future land use that will be restoration of the
5 Tennessee Hollow riparian corridor or the Quartermaster
6 Reach marsh area.

7 And so we are doing that work, as well, and
8 we have pulled together all of the old fill and are doing
9 analysis, and we have been coordinating with Lori Coach
10 is also the project manager on that.

11 So Agnes, the Water Board has indicated
12 that based on the constituents there, that they're not
13 Water Board jurisdiction. They're DTSC jurisdiction.

14 So DTSC is taking the lead on -- on the
15 review and analysis of issues associated with old fill.

16 MS. BLUM: Would you say that one of those
17 two agencies would be more rigorous than another in terms
18 of water quality in that particularly crucial area?

19 I mean, is there really a DTSC issue or is
20 it really a water quality issue?

21 MS. FANELLI: Well, most of the
22 contaminants in the old fill are not petroleum based.
23 They're metals and they're not really soluble elements.

24 So I think it's appropriate with DTSC. I
25 don't think either one is more or less rigorous than the

1 other, but one has chosen to be the lead agency.

2 That said, we copy -- just like on Mountain
3 Lake, we copy both agencies. So DTSC is the lead on
4 Mountain Lake, but we do copy Agnes and she's been
5 actively involved in the remediation design from a water
6 quality standpoint.

7 So even on old fill, we are reporting to
8 DTSC, but we copy Agnes. So to the extent the Water
9 Board does have a concern, they have an opportunity to
10 raise -- raise that concern to the trust.

11 MS. BLUM: Is this area A or area B or
12 both? It's a shared area, isn't it, at some point?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: B.

14 MS. BLUM: It's all B. Okay.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: Area A goes to the north
16 side of Mason Street.

17 MS. BLUM: Okay. So -- all right. So is
18 there still water quality sampling being done on the
19 Crissy Field -- on the area A side, Crissy Marsh?

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think there's still
21 marsh quality.

22 MS. BLUM: Maybe Caltrans is doing
23 monitoring or Park Service?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not sure. We're
25 doing it under a grant. I'm not sure how that's being

1 done right now.

2 MS. BLUM: Well, jumping ahead, would the
3 Park Service be doing water quality monitoring on the
4 marsh once this -- the connection to Quartermaster Reach
5 is completed?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not sure that that is
7 a trigger one way or another.

8 MS. BLUM: Okay.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: I'm not sure of the exact
10 status of monitoring of Crissy Marsh right now. So I
11 can't say whether change -- I don't think it will change,
12 but I don't know what it is, so I can't speak very
13 authoritatively.

14 MS. BLUM: Would that be part of a Trust
15 obligation to make sure that the water's clear once it
16 leaves the area B?

17 MS. FANELLI: I know that the Trust does
18 have a water quality monitoring plan that was done in
19 2006, and we do monitor at several locations in Tennessee
20 Hollow now, and I imagine that that monitoring would --
21 I'm pretty sure we monitor Thompson's Reach, as well.

22 I imagine that will be a change if there
23 was a new water that needed to be monitored.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: Maybe Terri could talk
25 about that, too.

1 MS. BLUM: Maybe that could be discussed
2 when the remedy is discussed or the public process comes
3 into play on fillsite 6B, which is contingent to that.

4 MS. FANELLI: Right.

5 MS. BLUM: Or adjacent to it.

6 MS. FANELLI: It's adjacent to it. There
7 will be a soil management plan for fillsite 6B, just that
8 debris and how we would handle that.

9 MS. BLUM: Okay. Thank you for that
10 left-hand turn.

11 MS. FANELLI: Thank you. You're welcome.

12 I understand that there's a lot of passion
13 around our restoration program, and it's a great program,
14 you know.

15 It's wonderful to have a -- sort of a
16 really urban creeks that aren't really urban creeks and
17 waterways. In the same sense of the community.

18 Yeah. So there are some miscellaneous
19 sites still, the unknown sites that we're catching up
20 right now. I don't have a lot to report.

21 We have a couple of evaluations. We have
22 completed -- we're sharing them right now with the Park
23 Service. We're waiting to get Park Service comments, and
24 then when we get them out, we'll certainly copy the RAB
25 on them.

1 But we're playing a little bit of catch-up
2 on some of these miscellaneous unknown sites.

3 It's a little bit of stressful way this
4 summer. Not only do we have a lot of construction
5 projects, but our tail is a little long.

6 Obviously my staff is not getting any
7 bigger, and I'm only able to contract out additional
8 services now to help us.

9 And at some point, there's a diminishing
10 returns, because you kind of need a brain trust at the
11 end.

12 So hiring out is not necessarily going to
13 make our internal workload that much easier.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Can you only contract out
15 because there isn't any more money for the Trust to pay
16 for the things that weren't included in the insurance
17 contract?

18 MS. FANELLI: It's just a whole --

19 MS. CHEEVER: Internal personnel?

20 MS. FANELLI: The Trust as a whole is
21 refocusing the types of folks that it has employed. So
22 yeah, they wouldn't hire somebody full-time.

23 It wouldn't make sense to hire somebody
24 full-time for a program that's not going to be in
25 existence for over a year. You have to have a follow-up

1 plan where you can move some people, or you have to have
2 another job after that.

3 There isn't a good business case to hire
4 people, and that makes sense. You wouldn't be able to
5 track many people if you say, "I'm only going to hire you
6 for a year and then -- then you're not going to have a
7 job. We're going to lay you off."

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: We do it all the time.

9 MS. CHEEVER: In this job market, you
10 might.

11 MS. FANELLI: I think the smarter to hire
12 out and continue to use our consultants. It makes more
13 sense.

14 We actually have a lot of deep consultant
15 base with a lot of historic knowledge. It's just a
16 burden for Alan, Genevieve and Nina to manage all those
17 multiple efforts at one time and keep things going.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. Any more questions?
19 No? Okay.

20 Final report planning. Do you have a
21 present for me?

22 MS. CHEEVER: I do. This is actually -- a
23 friend said -- I told a friend once I was an archivist, a
24 pack rat. She said, "No, you're not. You're an
25 archivist."

1 These are a lot of agendas. Not all.

2 MS. BLUM: Oh, my God.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Maybe you have all those in
4 your file, Brian.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: 1995.

6 MS. BLUM: 1995.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Remember how there was the
8 government shutdown then.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: Yes.

10 MS. CHEEVER: There's messages about
11 meeting cancelled because of government shutdown. But I
12 didn't even find my old rosters yet, although sometimes
13 there's an address.

14 MS. SEGAL: I have some old ones, too.

15 MS. CHEEVER: I have a lot more stuff.
16 And I'm thinking --

17 MS. SEGAL: Meeting around a table on
18 something.

19 MS. CHEEVER: We could have a meeting
20 around my kitchen table. But actually, Jan, what are
21 your -- what are your latest thoughts about that?

22 MS. MONAGHAN: We were talking about
23 getting rosters together, getting agendas together and
24 kind of outlining the things, the structure of the
25 organization, and I have the bylaws now. Julian's copy,

1 the best and final copy, and so I was thinking about
2 figuring out how to put these on a shared access, right?

3 MS. CHEEVER: Mm-hmm. You mean like
4 scanning them?

5 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. I don't know. Let
6 me look at it.

7 MS. CHEEVER: Those are only agendas.

8 MS. SEGAL: Maybe a subgroup could figure
9 out what direction or how it should be.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: Looking at the agendas for
11 each year, we can decide what the topics were for that
12 year, right. They repeat themselves month after month,
13 year after year.

14 MS. CHEEVER: Well, I'm interested in this
15 project and I've just been out of town which I'm still
16 recovering from, but I don't have any unusual things on
17 my schedule for several months, so I could host a meeting
18 at my kitchen table with all my files if you would like
19 that.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

21 MS. CHEEVER: We could even set a time for
22 it now, I mean, before the next RAB meeting. We could
23 come up with --

24 MS. FANELLI: Have a working session.

25 MS. CHEEVER: It would be like a committee

1 meeting.

2 MS. FANELLI: The electronic calendars
3 have come out.

4 MS. SEGAL: I'm having my knee replaced.
5 I'm not going to be available.

6 MS. CHEEVER: I know I ask this again and
7 again, when you say "not going to be here next year,"
8 when do you think the work of the remediation will be
9 done?

10 MS. FANELLI: My goal, my personal goal is
11 to see the Water Board order and the DTSC order rescinded
12 or otherwise modified by May 2014 --

13 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

14 MS. FANELLI: -- because we've
15 substantially completed everything.

16 MS. CHEEVER: We're talking about a whole
17 year.

18 MS. FANELLI: It's eleven months. Less
19 than a year. I remind my staff of that every staff
20 meeting. We have a countdown.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: We should have a
22 countdown clock mounted.

23 MS. FANELLI: We are working fast and
24 curious to get all the major issues. We know we have O&M
25 that extends beyond the period, and the Trust is aware of

1 that and we're budgeting and setting up plans for that.

2 Detailed structure of how it will be set up
3 is not decided, but, you know, we know that there are
4 those activities that have to be done.

5 There's probably some unknown sites that
6 aren't part of the RSL that will have a longer term that
7 need to be assessed, and there's probably been the
8 obligation of the Army for unknown contamination even
9 used the Zurich REEL policy.

10 Certainly things we know will happen, but
11 we know that it's not a big pile. It's a somewhat
12 foreseeable pile that then has a set of standardized
13 response actions that we've developed.

14 But the work that's in the order and the
15 agreement will be substantially completed, and we'll have
16 documented in our own report.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

18 MS. FANELLI: How we did that in a very
19 simply level. That's the goal.

20 So we are working hard to get those loose
21 ends together.

22 MS. CHEEVER: For a date for our meeting,
23 right now it's -- who in this room is willing to be on
24 the committee? One, Jan. Two Jan?

25 MS. SEGAL: I would like to, but I can't.

1 MS. CHEEVER: You'll be on it, but not
2 this early. Are you interested?

3 MS. BLUM: I suggest you contact Doug Kern
4 and include Mark Youngkin, because those guys have
5 enormous institutional knowledge.

6 MS. CHEEVER: I know, as Jan will see when
7 we start going through this, when we set a date.

8 MS. BLUM: What about Tuesday?

9 MS. CHEEVER: To the RAB in general?

10 MS. MONAGHAN: What about Tuesday the
11 25th?

12 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah. The only thing is
13 that -- in the evening.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. You have to work.
15 We all do.

16 MS. CHEEVER: Okay. Why don't we say
17 7:00, which is our regular time.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: Tuesday the 25th at 7:00.
19 At my house. 44 - 26th Avenue. All right.

20 MS. FANELLI: I feel that I'm happy
21 because after all this discussions, the first time I've
22 heard a subcommittee meeting at an offsite location.

23 MS. BLUM: Well, the women take action.

24 MS. SEGAL: The night before my surgery.

25 MS. CHEEVER: You should come.

1 MS. FANELLI: Maybe to keep your mind off
2 of it.

3 MS. BLUM: I'd like to ask the senior
4 members of the RAB, Mark and Doug and you and Jan I know
5 were part of the original group.

6 MS. CHEEVER: Actually, Mark and I came on
7 about a year and a half after it was founded.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: Doug and I are the only
9 originals.

10 MS. BLUM: The founders, the RAB.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Then already people like
12 Peter O'Hara. Some of these have --

13 MS. BLUM: Peter was on for years, very
14 involved.

15 MS. SEGAL: I see some of these names.

16 MS. CHEEVER: I just want to show you,
17 some of these have rosters.

18 MS. SEGAL: Todd Broom, Roberta Blank.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Some of them have.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: There's a fax list, because
21 they used to fax the agenda to us.

22 MS. CHEEVER: We didn't even have a home
23 fax.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: We didn't have a computer.

25 MS. BLUM: That would be interesting

1 technologically.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Two people were notified by
3 e-mail instead of by fax. One of them was Joanne
4 Winthrop and I forget the other one, but two advanced
5 people.

6 So actually, I think this meeting that
7 we're having relatively soon.

8 MS. SEGAL: What is your phone number?

9 MS. CHEEVER: 415-387-6843.

10 We should all have rosters with everyone's
11 information.

12 MS. SEGAL: I think we do.

13 MS. CHEEVER: Which is supposed to be
14 updated even so often. I think at this meeting, those of
15 us that are currently in the RAB can talk about how to
16 draw in other people. The former.

17 MS. SEGAL: With historical knowledge.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Does that sound --

19 MS. MONAGHAN: Sure. Finding them will be
20 a trick.

21 MS. BLUM: Maybe get a quote from some of
22 those people from the Army who may remember the good old
23 days.

24 MS. SEGAL: Colonel somebody.

25 MS. BLUM: Those war stories, very

1 emotional war stories about starting with the RAB.

2 MS. SEGAL: And we flushed out what the
3 expectations are for the report?

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Well, what we've talked
5 about is just doing the high-level recap of the RAB's
6 activities and what made it so unique.

7 Because it's a unique situation here, not a
8 base closure, that is being made into houses or
9 something. It's a park. So there's certain things that
10 we did like the bylaws and things are different than
11 other RABs have done.

12 MS. SEGAL: Oh, yeah. I imagine that the
13 Presidio RAB is unique across the country. It's just a
14 question of what --

15 MS. MONAGHAN: I always thought it would
16 be nice to have a list of all the people that have been
17 on it over the years.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Maybe even before the 26th,
19 I'll find it.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Started at the beginning,
21 who started the RAB, the technical review committee and
22 all --

23 MS. CHEEVER: Actually, do you have that
24 information?

25 MS. FANELLI: I have an updated RAB list.

1 I'd have to ask Denise if she kept earlier lists.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would guess that the
3 Army files are transferred to your laborer.

4 MS. FANELLI: I'm sure there's ones at
5 different point in time, but I don't know that I have any
6 that's complete. I don't think I have a running list of
7 people who --

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Up to '90 -- from early
9 '90s to the RAB.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: To '95 to '99 is Army.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. The TRC was, and
12 those records should have been information filed in boxes
13 and were transferred no your laborer.

14 MS. FANELLI: You can always contact
15 Barbara Janis. She can do a search of the records.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: We have some in our
17 archives, but there's a period of time that our files
18 were not going straight into archives, so we are caught
19 up in a backlog.

20 But I've seen the TRC meetings. I know we
21 have a full set of them.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. We don't want them.

23 MS. SEGAL: Okay. Maybe we can talk about
24 it, what is the goal and the purpose and the expectation
25 of them.

1 MS. MONAGHAN: We can talk about that.

2 MS. SEGAL: I understand.

3 MS. BLUM: Do you ever publish your
4 minutes or only by request? Are your minutes published
5 someplace?

6 THE REPORTER: I presume they're published
7 in the Presidio archives.

8 MS. FANELLI: We have a copy of that.

9 MS. BLUM: Are those copied?

10 MS. FANELLI: Not all of them are
11 electronics.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: And there weren't notes in
13 the Army.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: Sure, there are.

15 MS. MONAGHAN: We didn't have a court
16 reporter.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was that time before
18 my time when there was the dispute over the note-taking
19 accuracy, and so by the time I was here, there was a
20 court reporter.

21 So by the mid to late '95 with maybe a
22 couple of exceptions, every meeting had a court reporter.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: I just remember the
24 arguments about the notes.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that was in early

1 '95.

2 MS. CHEEVER: I remember, all these things
3 are recorded somewhere. What happens to -- what do you
4 do?

5 MS. MONAGHAN: They're at the Trust
6 library.

7 MS. CHEEVER: What do you do with the
8 transcripts that he creates?

9 MS. FANELLI: I put them in a file. I
10 don't normally use them unless I had a reason to go back
11 to them.

12 I can't think of any reason to go back to
13 them other than maybe during some of the lawsuits
14 where --

15 MS. SEGAL: People say something happen.

16 MS. BLUM: But just to be clear, they're
17 also in the Trust library.

18 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. Barbara Janis.

19 MS. MONAGHAN: This is all the
20 subcommittee.

21 MS. CHEEVER: The planned subcommittee.
22 This file that I have we has RAB organization has many
23 more plans for subcommittee.

24 MS. BLUM: That will be a lot of meetings.
25 Two hours a week for how many years?

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. So Tuesday, June
2 25th at Julie's house.

3 MS. CHEEVER: If we ask things of -- I
4 know that you -- your staff is sort of stretched thin,
5 but if they ask things of Denise, how much of an
6 imposition is that?

7 MS. FANELLI: Well, Denise is not in the
8 department anymore. She is in -- she's moved over to
9 1750. So you missed the beginning part of that
10 discussion.

11 I have a temp. So if there's information
12 that you're looking for, you can send me a request. If
13 it's something that's in our main library, I'd prefer you
14 go to Barbara Janis first because that's her job is to
15 find information, and I would be pulling some of the
16 resources.

17 But if it's something that I know we have
18 or it's something common, send me a request and I'll see
19 what I can do to find it.

20 MS. BLUM: And Barbara Janis is at
21 building 103, is she not?

22 MS. FANELLI: Correct.

23 MS. BLUM: She's very helpful. I used to
24 use her services quite a bit. J-a-n-i-s is her last
25 name. She's trying.

1 MS. FANELLI: BJanis at Presidio Trust dot
2 gov.

3 MS. CHEEVER: This is what Mark said at
4 another meeting, which is to take specific topics. So
5 that's all the time?

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

7 MS. CHEEVER: That's all the same
8 wavelength.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Okay.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Highlights and lowlights.

12 MS. SEGAL: Lessons learned.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh, God. Okay. We know
14 there's no public comment tonight.

15 MS. BLUM: Well, I do want to announce
16 there is a really important meeting coming up for the
17 Presidio Trust, which is on the 17th when the
18 finalists -- this doesn't have anything to do with the
19 RAB.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Oh.

21 MS. BLUM: But it has to do with the
22 commissary reuse, and because George Lucas is busy
23 packing the house, it's been suggested that those people
24 that are interested in speaking get there about 5:45 when
25 the doors open.

1 The meeting starts at 6:30, and you'll be
2 able to sign up to speak if you get there early enough
3 and not be at the nine o'clock hour.

4 And the meeting will be held at Herbst Hall
5 on Moraga in the Presidio, which is just down the street
6 from the Officer's Club. So this will be a pretty
7 interesting evening.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: And that's June 17th.
9 Okay.

10 MS. BLUM: The meeting starts at 6:30, but
11 the doors open at 5:45.

12 MS. FANELLI: I know the Trust is having
13 their open house tomorrow night seven o'clock. It's the
14 annual sort of update where all different trails projects
15 and forestry projects, just a little kind of open house.
16 Starts, I believe at 6:30 to 7:00.

17 It's in 103, and informal, but there will
18 be little five-minute presentations by various people and
19 a chance to ask questions.

20 I'm pretty positive Terri will be there.
21 If you're interested in face time with her.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. Agenda items for the
23 next time. We're asking for Terri to come, talk about a
24 couple things. The golfcourse and 6B.

25 MS. FANELLI: Terri won't have much to say

1 about 6B, but she'll have plenty to say about the
2 golfcourse.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. Good.

4 MS. CHEEVER: Golfcourse in relation to
5 Mountain Lake.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Yes.

7 MS. BLUM: I'll contact her.

8 MS. FANELLI: We may have some additional
9 analysis completed on 6B, and to the extent we do,
10 obviously we'll let you know about it.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: We should have some data
12 from the north arm.

13 MS. FANELLI: We should have data on the
14 north arm.

15 MS. BLUM: Let's see. Next month is July.
16 When is this meeting? We always run into holidays.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Maybe we will have a report.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: May be.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: July 9th.

20 MS. BLUM: Okay. No problem.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: I'll be gone, but I'm sure
22 you'll do fine without me.

23 MS. BLUM: I'll take some notes.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. Anything else from
25 anybody?

1 MS. BLUM: Congratulations on leading the
2 meeting. Excellent job.

3 MS. MONAGHAN: Meeting adjourned if
4 there's no other questions.

5 (The meeting concluded at 8:22 PM).

6 ---o0o---

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2013

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Mark Youngkin, Facilitator

Eileen Fanelli

4 Terri Thomas

Brian Ullensvang

5 Julie Cheever

Gloria Gee

6 Edward Callanan

Jan Blum

7 John Budroe

Paul Epstein

8

9 ---o0o---

10

11

12

13

14

15 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice
16 of the Meeting, and on July 9, 2013, 7:03 PM at Building
17 67, Presidio of San Francisco, California, before me,
18 MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of California,
19 there commenced a RAB meeting under the provisions of the
20 Presidio Trust.

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements:	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations:	
7	A. Terri Thomas, Mountain Lake and Fillsite 6B	4
8	B. Eileen Fanelli, Progress Reports	
9	- Mountain Lake Construction	46
10	- North Arm Sediment Sampling	49
11	- Other projects underway: BB1A, BB2, BAPR	52
12	5) Old/New Business:	
13	A. RAB Final Report	59
14	6) Public Comment - None	
15	7) Action Items and Agenda Items - Not discussed	
16	8) Closing:	102
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the
2 regular monthly meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board
3 of the Presidio San Francisco. My name is Mark Youngkin,
4 community co-chair, acting facilitator.

5 Does everybody have on agenda? There's a
6 correction on the agenda. Item 4A should be fillsite 6A.

7 Besides that, everything looks okay to
8 everybody? Any additions, corrections?

9 Seeing none, agenda approved.

10 Announcements? Any announcements, Jan?

11 MS. FANELLI: No.

12 MS. BLUM:

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Moving on to item
14 4, discussions and presentations. Terri Thomas from the
15 Presidio Trust Natural Resources Department. Welcome.

16 MS. THOMAS: So I am going to focus my
17 presentation on Mountain Lake because I'm not really sure
18 what we wanted at 6A. Hopefully it will still be what
19 you all are looking for, and if not, let me know.

20 So I'm going to take you a little bit
21 through some history that I have a feeling you all know,
22 but anyway, I just wanted to make sure you all know.

23 When -- of course we all know where
24 Mountain Lake is, and you can see that the highway goes
25 very close to it.

1 When it used to be larger, there were
2 several impacts to it, and we'll talk about it in a
3 second, as well, and eventually it had so many impacts to
4 it that it really got very muddy and the water was taken
5 out of it to water the golfcourse and horses got stuck in
6 it and all that. So there's a lot of history to this
7 lake that you all know.

8 I wanted to show you this map because at
9 this particular time, you can see that Mountain Lake
10 is -- there is no road. There's no road to the side of
11 Mountain Lake.

12 There's no Highway 1, and you can see that
13 it goes right along the road next to the park, and also
14 you can see the East Arm coming up, which isn't in a lot
15 of maps, and also you can see the -- the pipeline that
16 went out of the East Arm that the -- that the City tried
17 to build, and we found it, of course, at the fillsite
18 landfill 2, and this is an 1857 map.

19 So it kind of gives you a picture of that
20 particular timeframe.

21 And, you know, during the time before that
22 and the time after that, obviously Mountain Lake was a
23 water body that was attractive to Native Americans and
24 explorers, and so a lot of the animals in the lake were
25 taken out as well as the lake filled in, and it has taken

1 sometime to figure out what used to be in the lake.

2 But we've been working on that because --
3 and a lot of them were food animals like mussels for food
4 or frogs for frog legs and turtles for turtle soup that
5 slowly got eaten by the people around Mountain Lake, and
6 this map shows the topography on the bottom, which is an
7 1871 map that we had the topography map, and this is over
8 the 2011 aerial photo.

9 So you can see how big the map gets over to
10 the side and it crosses over Highway 1 and that used to
11 be, you know, that large all the way through there, and
12 you can also see going up the East Arm, the topography.

13 I don't need to get up and point to that.
14 You guys can see that, see what I'm talking about.

15 So it used to be large up like this all the
16 way around and out like this. Okay?

17 MS. BLUM: What's the crosshatched area?

18 MS. THOMAS: That would be on the way --
19 I'm not quite sure. I think that might have been
20 gardens. This was one of the geotech survey maps and
21 they have --

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Truck gardens.

23 MS. FANELLI: My understanding is when the
24 Army allowed the Department of Treasury to be over the
25 Public Health Services Hospital area, it actually

1 included Mountain Lake or a large portion of it and they
2 grew their food to feed the folks at the hospital right
3 there.

4 So I believe those were the gardens that
5 fed the patients at the hospital.

6 MS. BLUM: And the pipe was built by the
7 City to take water out of Mountain Lake to feed the City,
8 the pipe along the North Arm?

9 MS. FANELLI: The East Arm.

10 MS. BLUM: I mean the East Arm.

11 MS. THOMAS: Yes. The tunnel was actually
12 going to assist in the water for San Francisco. So they
13 built the flow meter around Lobos Street and they needed
14 more water.

15 They ended up calling it the City's Folly
16 because they ended up not being able to complete it.

17 MS. BLUM: Huh. Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. THOMAS: Some of it's still there.

19 MS. BLUM: Okay. Got it. Thank you very
20 much.

21 MS. THOMAS: So we're still kind of -- it
22 will be interesting to follow the hydrology and see how
23 that all works out.

24 So anyway, because of all of these impacts,
25 not only did the fauna go, but also the flora went and it

1 was very difficult to keep the lake oxygenated, and it
2 will be in the future.

3 The East Arm of Mountain Lake has a wetland
4 in it. You all know where we are, right? The West
5 Pacific goes across and Mountain Lake is downstream and
6 this is the East Arm.

7 The dotted area, the detached area is the
8 existing wetland, and the other three little polygons are
9 ones that we will be restoring to wetland, and I'll tell
10 you a little bit more about how that's going to all fit
11 together in a little bit.

12 So the goals of the restoration project
13 after remediation -- which thank goodness remediation did
14 this because it never would have been possible without
15 it.

16 A goal of the project is to increase the
17 body of knowledge of urban lake restoration and re-
18 introductions.

19 Because we don't know if anything we're
20 going to do is going to be successful, actually, but
21 because of this opportunity, we want to make sure that we
22 can do everything we can to try to make it successful.

23 So we really wanted to gather researchers
24 and other people that were interested in publishing this
25 work and experimenting with this work to try to do it.

1 We want to make sure we increase water
2 clarity from pre-remediation and lower nutrient levels.

3 We want to reestablish submerged aquatic
4 plants, because those plants actually pull the -- pull
5 nutrients out of the water.

6 So it will assist in lowering the nutrient
7 levels. They pull it out of the water column and they
8 also provide oxygen and they also keep out algae.

9 And then we want to increase the native
10 faunal diversity, manage detrimental human activities and
11 manage the mosquito populations. So those are kind of
12 our goals.

13 This is an example of submerged aquatic
14 vegetation. They are a pathway so that they root in the
15 sediments and they are a pathway to that anoxic bed and
16 they can actually take out nutrients from both the water
17 and the water column.

18 So these are the ones that we are
19 reestablishing there, and as far as the plants, the
20 Presidio native plant nursery will be growing them.

21 We've talked with the Romberg Tiburon
22 plant. They're now growing submergible vegetation.
23 There will be a whole submerged aquatic vegetation part
24 of the nursery that will be water and stuff. It will be
25 very interesting.

1 The key here, though, is these plants are
2 damaged by certain fish and mainly karp, which is the
3 fish that's in there.

4 We had a couple of papers done by Peter
5 Bay. With the fish present, they probably won't be able
6 to survive. So we really need to try to get rid of the
7 fish.

8 They also provide amphibian habitat and I
9 mentioned that they will gather nutrients in their
10 leaves. If the leaves get too big, we'll have to harvest
11 the SAV to get it out.

12 In Romberg Tiburon, they already just -- by
13 growing the submerged aquatic vegetation, they attracted
14 the native snails that would help maintain that by eating
15 algae off the leaves.

16 So that actually started to get established
17 in the nursery over there and we're assuming it might
18 happen at ours, too.

19 So as you know, last summer, we began our
20 fish removal and we really would like to do it with all
21 mechanical capture.

22 Of course it was very difficult. We want
23 to do it as humanely as possible, and we were successful
24 in a large way, but not completely.

25 We took the animals up to Sonoma Reptile

1 Rescue and they were able -- the bigger ones survived,
2 and Sonoma Reptile accepted a lot, 22 turtles and 22
3 adult fish, and we could announce it as a place where
4 other pet owners could take their unwanted pets in the
5 future instead of dumping them into Mountain Lake.

6 We're looking for other alternatives for
7 animals that get put into Mountain Lake.

8 And we gathered a number of partners to
9 work on this from the researcher. Since this is an urban
10 population, that the biggest -- biggest impact we can
11 make is in research and education, and then hopefully
12 everything will fall together and we'll be able to
13 continue to research and educate everyone.

14 And they all really recommended that it
15 could be very possible that just mechanical and removal
16 alone would not remove the fish.

17 So we're trying to look at other
18 possibilities and figure out how to best keep those fish
19 out as well as put in the native fish.

20 So I'm not going to go through the
21 vegetation restoration because it's all on the signs out
22 at Mountain Lake, and I think since you guys have all
23 seen the flyers, I'm just going to talk about the final
24 restoration.

25 And these are the areas where we have been

1 thinking about. Our -- we do have a master student
2 working at San Francisco State that's working on this
3 particular project and has done a complete literature
4 search of all of the species that used to be in the area
5 and what their needs are, and these are the ones that we
6 have figured that we'll be able to give a possibility to.

7 So let's see what's coming back. Actually,
8 I'll go through them all independently so I won't name
9 them all knew now, but you can see that it not only
10 includes the lake, but also the East Arm, because the
11 East Arm does seem to have more nesting and quiet and
12 protected wetland habitat, which is good for amphibians
13 and reptiles to actually lay eggs and rear their young,
14 and then it has the open water where they can actually do
15 a lot of their adult fishing and things.

16 So one of the first things we'll introduce
17 the chorus frog. The chorus frog is the one that you can
18 hear in all the movies. They kind of like took the sound
19 of the chorus frog and they use the same thing in every
20 movie.

21 They are going to be really easy to
22 introduce. They have shown up in the Presidio recently
23 and most lately at landfill 8.

24 So they're in that wetland in there, and
25 they've been pretty easy to transfer. So we think we'll

1 be able to do this pretty soon.

2 The rough skinned newt we think we we'll be
3 able to do pretty soon. We're not exactly sure which
4 subspecies it was, but that will probably be a little bit
5 later once we figure out exactly there.

6 The three signed stickleback is a critical
7 piece to the whole picture. It is so far in Lobos Creek,
8 and the National Park Service is going to help us
9 relocate them into Mountain Lake, also.

10 We do not know what to expect. We thought
11 Mountain Lake might have been fishless, but this fish is
12 going to be very important to mosquito control in the
13 future and also just as the major fish in the lake.

14 So we want to be able to put it in as soon
15 as possible. Of course, we can't put it in until we have
16 all the other fish gone. That's really a critical
17 juncture.

18 MR. EPSTEIN: Excuse me. I thought all
19 the fish were removed from the lake.

20 MS. THOMAS: We tried, but if you still go
21 out there, you'll still see some fish.

22 My take is what we'll end up doing is going
23 through another summer of that, of mechanically removing
24 the fish, and then during this next year, work with
25 whatever we need to do to figure out the best way to make

1 sure we have those last -- the last fish so that we can
2 put these in, and it will be setting the restoration back
3 a bit, but it will be very protective to try to figure
4 out exactly what to do.

5 Right now we're looking at mechanically
6 removing all the ones we can, making sure we can
7 completely block the lake if we can and we're still just
8 looking into if we can.

9 These are all if we can, and then possibly
10 apply an organic targeted fish pesticide to the very last
11 few.

12 I'm not sure if that's going to all work
13 out. We're going to have to go through a more drastic
14 removal process, but first we're going to try to get them
15 out next summer mechanically and see where we are.

16 It's really hard to know, you know, if all
17 of those little guys are gone. And they do all get big.
18 But you'll definitely be hearing more about that. We'll
19 keep you up-to-date.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Is that eggs on the
21 bottom of the picture?

22 MS. THOMAS: They do look like eggs.

23 MS. BLUM: Are these the same as in
24 Thompson Reach?

25 MS. THOMAS: They are stickleback.

1 MS. CHEEVER: Are you saying one of your
2 challenges is there are already eggs in the mud?

3 MS. THOMAS: We either need to get all the
4 large ones before they spawn, which would be our hope,
5 which would be like February, which might be good timing
6 for remediation if we can just get all those large ones
7 out of there, but if there's any large ones, you know,
8 after March, they could have spawned.

9 So the -- if that's the case, which it
10 could be, then you wouldn't really know. Then we'll have
11 to punt.

12 So we're actually looking into a lot of
13 options. We're having -- we're actually having a plan
14 just for the fish to make sure that we can really kind of
15 address it and address the public's questions when they
16 come out and the Park Service, make sure we can --
17 nothing can get into Lobos Creek. We want to make sure
18 Lobos Creek stays safe.

19 It's a challenge, but like I said, this is
20 about research and education and we'll just kind of keep
21 moving forward as we can.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Do any of them get sucked up
23 in the dredging?

24 MS. FANELLI: Potentially bottom dwellers
25 do. They would be ground up. They wouldn't survive.

1 MS. THOMAS: We do have craw fishing
2 there, too.

3 MS. FANELLI: We're actually getting ready
4 to break open the bags probably toward the end of the
5 week and haul off the first round. That will be very
6 interesting to see.

7 MS. THOMAS: What's in the bags, that's
8 right.

9 This was one of the reasons we found out
10 that there was three-spined stickleback was actually in
11 the lake is we found in the historic documents that there
12 was a freshwater mussel, and this mussel is a very common
13 California mussel.

14 It's not in Mountain Lake anymore, but part
15 of its life history is on a fish. Without the
16 three-spined stickleback, the mussels can't survive in
17 Mountain Lake.

18 We are tracking that, and one of the
19 interesting things about this is -- this may be the first
20 species that we are experimenting with back in the lake
21 and it may happen in November if we can work things out.

22 Stanford is -- wants to do some research
23 and actually all the universities, we had them add an
24 educational component for each of the species, so they
25 have an educational component, as well, and they're going

1 to be seeing how they can raise these mussels at Mountain
2 Lake and also how much these mussels can help filter out
3 any metals that could be in Mountain Lake, because these
4 are really good at filtering out metals. We're also
5 hoping that they can document filtering out nutrients.

6 These are the people at Stanford, Dr.
7 Lucy, and Levine is the woman, the graduate student
8 that's working specifically on that, and she'd be
9 checking them every week and educating the public at the
10 same time.

11 Sonoma State and San Francisco Zoological
12 Society or San Francisco Zoo have been working on raising
13 pond turtles for a while, and the timing was just
14 perfect.

15 They were ready to introduce them to a
16 natural lake and see how they worked at a natural lake
17 the same time our lake came forward. The genetics worked
18 out all right.

19 So basically Sonoma State has been doing a
20 lot of the research and San Francisco Zoo has found out
21 how to raise these turtles.

22 These are our native pond turtles. At this
23 point in time, the zoo actually has about fifty turtles
24 for our lake and they will be putting up a shadow box
25 that these will be the Mountain Lake turtles and they'll

1 be growing them to make sure they're big enough to pass
2 predation to put into the lake.

3 They'll all be tagged and they'll be
4 researching how they do it during that time.

5 Mosquitoes have always been a concern at
6 the East Arm of Mountain Lake and we have recognized that
7 and we're also worried that by taking all the fish out of
8 Mountain Lake, there could be a mosquito population that
9 could come out right after that.

10 So we're concerned about public safety,
11 about West Nile virus.

12 We have had a regular testing program
13 through our IPM every year where West Nile has been found
14 in the Presidio in the mosquitoes, and so we do apply a
15 biological control and we'll probably be applying more
16 during this transition phase as the wetlands get
17 restocked with predators that eat mosquitoes.

18 We've taken the fish out that eat
19 mosquitoes, but we're putting back in all the amphibians
20 that eat mosquitoes, and the fish eat mosquitoes.

21 Once they're back in, we're hoping that we
22 can go back into the level of treatment we have now. We
23 will be testing through time to make sure there aren't an
24 over abundance of mosquitoes.

25 Also, everything that we're doing is

1 focused on education, and one of the things that -- let
2 me see if we have this next -- I don't think I have this
3 slide.

4 One of the things that the Water Board
5 required of us was to actually quantify how many people
6 we reach in educating to not be doing the detrimental
7 activities of feeding the wildlife and putting aquariums
8 into the lake.

9 So they have -- in our Adaptive Management
10 Plan, which we were required to do by the Water Board, we
11 have actually followed their advice on how to develop a
12 way to quantify how many people we reach, and it will be
13 interesting.

14 We actually -- we were talking about
15 America's Cup earlier. We have the same Water Board
16 regulator that was on the America's Cup and he suggested
17 the same thing that he did for America's Cup was to have
18 a pledge sign by the boat owners about not bringing in
19 any non-native fish, mussels and things on their boats,
20 and also that they would be telling the rest of their
21 boat folks and the public about non-native species and
22 how they can be, and they get to fly a flag up at the top
23 of their mast that says they've taken this pledge and
24 it's all good.

25 What we've tried to do is we're creating a

1 pledge and we can create something that we can also give
2 with the pledge to show that they've taken the pledge,
3 and at this point, although our permit isn't final, we're
4 kind of challenging ourselves to 10,000 pledges so that
5 we can really get out there and educate the public.

6 That's really going to have a key thing.
7 Again not to get those competitors back in the lake.

8 So really with every species -- I think
9 that's my last slide -- we have some academic university
10 that's also working on that species, so we'll be able to
11 kind of acknowledge how they've done through time and,
12 and that's what I had to say.

13 So if anybody has any questions --

14 MS. BLUM: With regard to any nutrient
15 loading --

16 MS. THOMAS: Oh.

17 MS. BLUM: -- particularly from the
18 golfcourse and/or surrounding neighborhoods. I think the
19 concern was after you've gone through all the remediation
20 and cleanup and restoration process, how will you be
21 monitoring the water to make sure it's meeting clarity
22 standards in addition to having all those animals do all
23 that work? And how can you control the golfcourse?

24 MS. THOMAS: So we have -- we have been
25 monitoring Mountain Lake for three years with a regular

1 monitoring program, and also the golfcourse monitors the
2 first flush.

3 So we monitor monthly, we meaning the
4 natural resources program, and then the golfcourse
5 monitors once a year, and we did have that data analyzed
6 by Alex Swan and we definitely know there's high nutrient
7 load. So we're going to try to do it from all different
8 angles.

9 The first angle is the East Arm of Mountain
10 Lake has West Pacific that has a lot of sediments and dog
11 nutrients that go into that area, and that's one of the
12 areas that the golfcourse monitors, as well, and we are
13 putting in -- we will -- just about at the same time,
14 next year we have funded to put in -- yeah. I wasn't
15 sure.

16 MS. FANELLI: I just want to push it off
17 so we don't burn off.

18 MS. THOMAS: And then we also have -- so
19 we'll be putting in BMPs along that big trail that all
20 the dog walkers use to try to hold the water before it
21 goes into the East Arm, and that is scheduled to begin
22 next year, and they're looking at options at this point
23 in time.

24 And then we also have funding for --

25 MS. CHEEVER: Would you say what BMPs are?

1 MS. THOMAS: I'm sorry. Best management
2 practices. It's not a very good name for it.

3 But there are areas where the water's
4 collected or cleaned or naturally filters through the
5 soil, but it's an area where we kind of stop the more
6 nutrient loaded water and get the nutrients out of it and
7 let it go a little bit cleaner on through there.

8 We're hoping to do those in two areas on
9 the golfcourse.

10 One the golfcourse is doing this year, but
11 I'm not exactly sure of the design. But we're funding
12 that.

13 In other words, we're not really
14 controlling the golfcourse, but we're going to be
15 mitigating for any of the waters coming off, but we're
16 also working with the golfcourse.

17 They know the work we're putting into
18 Mountain Lake. They don't want to put any extra
19 nutrients into Mountain Lake, either.

20 We're also being careful about their
21 practice. But we thought it was very extra cautious to
22 try to put in something that would clean the water before
23 it goes in, as well.

24 MR. EPSTEIN: What about eucalyptus trees?
25 Because there are certainly many of them that are along

1 the golfcourse and the north part of the lakes.

2 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. We took out about a
3 hundred eucalyptus trees right along the lake. The rest
4 of them are part of a historic forest.

5 As they age and need to come down, they'll
6 be replacing them with a different tree than eucalyptus
7 globulus.

8 It will still be a eucalyptus that's
9 similar in look and structure and can still kind of have
10 that same historic feeling to it.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Doesn't it hurt the lake
12 less?

13 MR. EPSTEIN: Non-very non-historic
14 because there are some very young eucalyptus among them.

15 MS. THOMAS: I don't think we're putting
16 any more -- all the eucalyptus that came out in the
17 irrigation program are not going back with the same
18 eucalyptus again, and I think as we monitor -- I really
19 believe the Trust wants to make sure that we keep the
20 lake healthy.

21 So, you know, as we start to monitor water
22 quality, if we find that eucalyptus is a problem, we'll
23 come back to the board. We're just hoping that the
24 eucalyptus won't be causing a problem.

25 MS. FANELLI: That was one of the reasons

1 that the change in species -- I'm not a forester, but it
2 drops a pod and it grows all -- the little tree next to
3 it.

4 In reestablishing the forest, they'll be
5 thinning it out and getting it back to its earlier nature
6 and using a type of species that's not quite as
7 aggressive.

8 MR. EPSTEIN: I thought it was the leaves
9 themselves that -- that were in the water. That's the
10 problem.

11 MS. THOMAS: And there are a little
12 allopathic and they kind of create this poison when they
13 drop.

14 So all I can say is I'm very aware of the
15 problem and I think that -- we are and we'll keep
16 watching it, but right now we have pretty much cut most
17 of them back and will in the East Arm, also, to that
18 exact historic makeup that the Jones plan had at the turn
19 of the century.

20 So we're hoping we can keep that because
21 that's part of the historic landmark. It's balancing.
22 We're balancing.

23 MS. BLUM: It sounds like you have almost
24 full control over two of the three options. The
25 golfcourse may be an exception because they still need to

1 do pest control and fertilizing or whatever it is that
2 you're using in instead of fertilizer.

3 So I'm wondering if the Trust has in the
4 third tier of their idea for this area a possibility of
5 saying no dog walking on West Pacific down the road, and
6 then just planting -- instead of eucalyptus, some other
7 species that isn't so toxic if that doesn't work.

8 MS. THOMAS: I think the eucalyptus is --

9 MS. BLUM: Is that number one?

10 MS. THOMAS: There's a definite
11 possibility and I think that we're already kind of doing
12 that. That's really what Peter's been focusing on using
13 different species.

14 The dog walking totally out of my --

15 MS. BLUM: Bailiwick.

16 MS. THOMAS: -- scope.

17 MS. BLUM: But that would be an option if
18 it continues to load into the lake.

19 MS. THOMAS: That's why we're trying to
20 make sure that we have options -- whether the dog walking
21 continues or whether the golfcourse continues, that we're
22 actually doing something to -- between that and the lake
23 so that the lake can still be protected.

24 MS. BLUM: Do you think the monitoring
25 will go on forever just to make sure that it stays clean

1 or is there an end in sight?

2 MS. THOMAS: I think through the Adaptive
3 Management Plan, I think we have committed to ten years.

4 MS. BLUM: All right.

5 MS. FANELLI: We have a long-term program.
6 Your department monitors a lot of the water bodies in the
7 Presidio and that's been going on for longer than the
8 last three years. Basically in perpetuity.

9 MS. BLUM: Of course if it's working, it's
10 working. That would probably signal the end of the
11 monitoring program.

12 MS. THOMAS: It doesn't, actually. You
13 never know what pops up in those monitoring programs out
14 of nowhere and you have to figure out the source.

15 They're good -- in a city, it's good to
16 have a monitoring program because things show up that
17 weren't there last year and then you know it, so --

18 MS. BLUM: Could you ever foresee the --
19 Mountain Lake being a source -- a small source of
20 drinking water?

21 MR. BERMAN: If you want some lead in your
22 water, sure.

23 MS. FANELLI: You know there's no
24 dissolved lead in that water.

25 MR. BERMAN: Right. That's what you said.

1 MS. BLUM: But not really.

2 MS. THOMAS: I don't know. I'm not a
3 drinking water person.

4 MS. BLUM: Yeah.

5 MS. THOMAS: I mean, I guess some of it
6 gets drunk a little bit because some of it goes -- gets
7 into the Lobos Creek watershed and it goes through our
8 water treatment plant and people do drink it, but it's
9 not right out of the lake.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's Lobos Creek
11 drainage, so it's part of the drinking water.

12 MS. BLUM: It could be a vital one in the
13 future.

14 MS. THOMAS: I think it's going to be a
15 very interesting five years to watch the lake and see
16 what this program started and where it grow from there.

17 It could be pretty exciting. I'm
18 optimistic.

19 MR. BERMAN: Speaking of the five years,
20 when do you think all the Highway 1 runoff will be
21 completely contained?

22 MS. THOMAS: That's a question for her.

23 MS. FANELLI: We have a project plan in
24 place and we're hoping to complete the environmental
25 documentation which would be the scoping, the

1 identification of the alternatives, the discussion with
2 the public and stakeholders, and we've calendared that
3 and we've scheduled that for this upcoming fiscal year.

4 So I think it should be beginning probably
5 late fall and we're hoping to complete it in that next
6 year.

7 The second year would be a design year
8 because you'd have to have the projects for both the
9 diversion piece, which Caltrans will be constructing, and
10 there's improvements to the overflow pipeline which is
11 related to it, but the Trust will be constructing.

12 So the design piece would then happen the
13 following year, which would be fiscal year '15, and we're
14 targeting fiscal year '16 for the construction. So a
15 slightly elongated schedule.

16 Relative to what remediation's been doing
17 the past several years, but a planning year, design year
18 and construction year is what we're looking at.

19 MR. EPSTEIN: Didn't Caltrans install some
20 things when they stabilized the --

21 MS. FANELLI: They did.

22 MR. EPSTEIN: -- the bank?

23 MS. FANELLI: They did. They put in
24 eighteen drop inlets that include roadway runoff, and in
25 addition to other surrounding Presidio areas, they

1 inserted treatment units which are basically filters that
2 remove particulate sediment and also include absorbent
3 material for any dissolved oils and greases.

4 So they have those installed in eighteen
5 drop inlets that lead to the lake or are in line with the
6 system that leads to the lake and they are in the
7 process -- they're maintaining those until we get the
8 diversion project constructed.

9 MR. EPSTEIN: I see.

10 MS. FANELLI: They're anxious to get the
11 diversion project constructed.

12 It's a good thing because Caltrans does not
13 want to be maintaining these temporary units for that
14 long. They would rather get a permanent fix and be able
15 to not worry about that issue anymore.

16 MR. EPSTEIN: And where do those pipes
17 that are on the North Arm, where do they come into all of
18 that?

19 MS. FANELLI: All the -- there's three
20 main inlets that bring in highway runoff. I'm going to
21 walk over to the map and just kind of point to it.

22 There's a couple directly off the highway.
23 I may not be pointing to their exact locations. And then
24 there's this North Arm pipe.

25 The North Arm pipe takes a little bit of

1 runoff from this portion, but it also carries water from
2 beneath MacArthur Tunnel.

3 MR. EPSTEIN: Springs.

4 MS. FANELLI: It's basically groundwater.

5 MR. EPSTEIN: Right.

6 MS. FANELLI: When they built the tunnel,
7 they built a French drain, an underdrain.

8 Caltrans -- part of their diversion project
9 is going to separate that flow. So the groundwater flow
10 from underneath MacArthur Tunnel will always continue to
11 discharge as it has historically through the pipes, and
12 that is usually about twenty GPM.

13 It's higher when it's the wet season and
14 rainy, but that's continual groundwater discharge.

15 The storm water will be rediverted so that
16 it does not drop into the lake. It will be intercepted
17 by the overflow pipeline that currently maintains the
18 water elevation in the lake.

19 MR. EPSTEIN: So the system will separate
20 those two sources of water?

21 MS. FANELLI: Yes, it will.

22 MR. EPSTEIN: Oh. And what about the --
23 wasn't there a plan to -- originally to clean the pipes
24 or pipe? I know there are two pipes, and now to cap
25 them? Where does that stand?

1 MS. FANELLI: There is a proposal that
2 Caltrans has prepared. It's in with DTSC for approval.
3 It is their plan to clean the pipes, and I believe
4 they're also proposing to line them, to improve them.

5 And they're going to line and clean the top
6 pipe. They're going to clean and cap and close off the
7 lower pipe. That's their proposal.

8 MS. CHEEVER: While we're talking about
9 this, it might be a good question for Terri.

10 Where is the upper end of the Mountain Lake
11 remediation area as far as traffic's concerned, the one
12 that's covered by the document in relation to the North
13 Arm?

14 MS. FANELLI: Well, they're doing
15 sampling, as you know, beneath or downstream at the ends
16 of the pipe.

17 We don't have that final report, but we do
18 know we're going to be removing some sediment from this
19 area because we've found that it has lead above our
20 cleanup number, and I don't have that plan for you
21 tonight because it hasn't been finalized.

22 We've done actually three rounds of
23 sampling. The first round, a more thorough second round
24 that you saw the workplan for and they've just gone out
25 and grabbed a couple of additional samples down here

1 between the surface water, the open water and where they
2 had their last sample to confirm the areas that they need
3 to dig out.

4 When we get that, of course that will be
5 all written up and sent off to DTSC and you'll all be
6 copied on it, and then it will be publicly a combination.

7 It could be a dredge, mechanical type
8 dredge. It could be hand digging. It could be a
9 combination. I'm not sure yet depending on how they have
10 to get in there.

11 To the extent we can get in from the water
12 side, we'll do that. Maybe with an excavator with a long
13 reach arm and there could be some hand work further up.

14 We're trying to avoid blazing in a trail in
15 here. We're trying not to damage or have collateral
16 damage around the wetlands and the trees here while we
17 get that original sediment out.

18 MS. CHEEVER: But what is the northernmost
19 limit of the area that's defined as the Mountain Lake
20 area in the document that are being used to include the
21 North Arm of mediation?

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The end of pipe
23 four.

24 MS. FANELLI: The end of the pipes. I
25 don't think that there is a set boundary in any of the

1 documents. There is the Mountain Lake study area, which
2 is larger.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Or the wetland
4 boundary.

5 MS. FANELLI: The wetlands were delineated
6 as part of the investigation activities that we did, and
7 I believe they're in one of the figures. If not, in the
8 RAP and the RDIP document that was submitted to DTSC.

9 So yes, our position still is that that
10 work is still covered under the existing RAP and doesn't
11 need to have third party or have an additional separate
12 decision document, if that's the question where you're
13 going, Jan.

14 MS. CHEEVER: But how about north?

15 MS. FANELLI: It's not going past the pipe
16 outlets. It's downstream of the pipe outlets. We would
17 be taking sediment downstream of the pipe outlets.

18 Caltrans has -- in their plan, which I
19 believe you were all copied on, is going to be sampling
20 the inside of the pipes, as well.

21 That was one of the requirements that the
22 Trust had to make sure that they were getting -- they're
23 not leaving any contamination behind.

24 MR. BERMAN: So this diversion, is it
25 essentially the last of the remediation projects in terms

1 of --

2 MS. FANELLI: The diversion project is
3 actually not a remediation project. It's a separate
4 agreement that was agreed to in the lawsuit between
5 Caltrans and the Trust.

6 So it's not considered remediation. I'm
7 working on it. So I'm sort of stepping outside of my
8 remediation hat to help manage that effort with Mark
9 Hurley in our remediation department.

10 MR. BERMAN: But in terms of the various
11 activities, if you sort of include that -- parentheses
12 include, it's sort of the last of the project, right?

13 MS. FANELLI: For resolving the Mountain
14 Lake issues, yes, I think so, outside of the restoration
15 activities, which have a much longer organic path in
16 front of them.

17 But there's an engineering fix and there's
18 just details on how we fix it that will be subject to a
19 NEPA/CEQA document.

20 It will probably be a joint document issued
21 by the Presidio Trust and Caltrans, because they're going
22 to have to rely on the same data in order to do their
23 designs.

24 MR. BERMAN: In terms of RAB activity, is
25 it something that's desirable to continue to follow

1 through till completion?

2 MS. FANELLI: Well, it's not a remediation
3 project. It's not an issue for DTSC or the Regional
4 Water Quality Control Board. To follow through as
5 members of the public, most definitely.

6 There's going to be a series of meetings
7 and outreach and public scoping meetings and discussions,
8 and there's no reason why the RAB shouldn't -- names
9 shouldn't be on that outreach list, and I can certainly
10 make sure that that happens.

11 MR. BERMAN: So formally even though the
12 RAB might disband, it should still sort of function in
13 some way because of this and some other projects that
14 will not be completed at the time of the -- of the so-
15 called official schedule?

16 MS. FANELLI: Certainly -- certainly as
17 members of the public -- and with your history record --
18 you guys should be participating in the public comments.

19 I don't know -- I'm not sure if you're
20 asking me if it will be as a RAB --

21 MR. BERMAN: Right.

22 MS. FANELLI: -- or as some type of public
23 body.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We've got another
25 topic coming up that touches on that.

1 MR. BERMAN: You want to talk about it
2 then.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Any more questions
4 for Terri?

5 MS. BLUM: I think that the issue came up
6 on 6A when we were discussing other projects that the
7 remediation department was engaged in and we had a
8 discussion about -- another discussion about
9 Quartermaster Reach.

10 I think there is some concern that -- there
11 is ongoing concern that there would be some infiltration
12 of toxic material into the extension that's planned for
13 Quartermaster Reach from 6A. I think that's kind of an
14 ongoing concern.

15 MS. FANELLI: From 6A. So 6A is the site
16 that's adjacent.

17 MS. BLUM: It's the one adjacent to
18 Quartermaster Reach.

19 MS. FANELLI: That's 6B.

20 MS. BLUM: It was 6B, then. I don't know
21 why.

22 MS. THOMAS: I think that that's -- there
23 is work on that, too.

24 MS. BLUM: And Quartermaster Reach is that
25 area of concern for infiltration.

1 MS. THOMAS: Okay.

2 MS. FANELLI: I can certainly give you a
3 little update on 6B.

4 MS. BLUM: Okay.

5 MS. FANELLI: We have not finished the
6 summary IR, but what we have been doing is completing at
7 DTSC's direction an evaluation of the site.

8 We have completed a human health and
9 technological risk assessment, and our proposed remedy is
10 to manage in place with land use controls, and those land
11 use controls would reflect whatever future requirements
12 there are to make sure that if we change the land use in
13 the developed area -- for example, if you build more
14 residences. There's already partial residential use down
15 there, or if we expand the wetland marsh -- that we do it
16 in a way that's safe.

17 And so there will be a decision document.
18 It will probably be the last decision document that's
19 issued for public review, and our target is to get that
20 out in October.

21 So I would imagine that we will be having
22 sort of pre-meetings once we get our document to DTSC
23 with the RAB, much as DTSC has had pre-meetings with you
24 before we've issued documents.

25 I'm hoping the end of August/September at

1 the latest in anticipation that we will be issuing
2 something for public review in October, and the proposed
3 remedy is manage in place for the land use control at
4 this point.

5 The data that we are evaluating is not
6 showing a significant human health risk, and -- for
7 fillsite 6B.

8 So we think that that is safe in its
9 current condition, but we would put a land use control in
10 place because future developments could occur and because
11 those developments may change the existing condition.

12 For example, in making a private backyard
13 space or something like that for residential units, then
14 we would want a land use control to make sure that that
15 use was still protected.

16 And similarly for the marsh expansion area,
17 there's just a little bit of fillsite 6B that really
18 overlaps with the boundaries of the restoration areas
19 outlined in the Tennessee Hollow EA or the Quartermaster
20 Reach EA.

21 So we're working off of the environmental
22 documents that was prepared for that expansion, and 6B is
23 in the eastern side, and not very much of it, and that's
24 where we're doing the ecological risk assessment in
25 determining what the appropriate management will be, and

1 that could be sampling to see if once the marsh is
2 constructed, there's nothing there.

3 MS. BLUM: When you say marsh, are you
4 talking about a wetland? You're not talking about the
5 expansion of Crissy Marsh that's been under discussion
6 for twenty years?

7 MS. FANELLI: I'm talking the
8 Quartermaster Reach construction.

9 MS. BLUM: Not the expansion of Crissy
10 Marsh.

11 MS. THOMAS: It is going to be marsh
12 habitat. It's kind of complicated. I think that the --
13 the dialogue about including -- it's going to be marsh
14 habitat, but it's not going to have the inflow.

15 MS. BLUM: All right. Thank you. It's
16 kind of a sensitive point that we've been working on for
17 years.

18 MS. FANELLI: What we envision that you're
19 going to see is the summary RI report which will be
20 alternatives.

21 We will likely recommend manage in place
22 because it's safe in its current configuration for
23 current land uses, and it will include details of a soil
24 management plan that will reflect what the Trust
25 requirements would be.

1 Whether the marsh is constructed or if
2 there's a change to the residential land use that
3 currently occurs in 6B.

4 So I'm talking about this Swords to
5 Plowshare facilities and there's another dormitory type
6 building. That's our residential plan in the 6B area.

7 There's other commercial activities, but
8 there is no recreational risk based on the data that we
9 have today.

10 There's a slight residential risk depending
11 on your assumptions, so that's why we're going to put a
12 land use control on that portion of it so that we can
13 make sure that we don't have an exposure risk should we
14 change the residential layout or how people live in the
15 area in the future.

16 Meaning that if we provided them with more
17 access to access the soil than we have today in some
18 future land use, we want to make sure that the area is
19 protected, and that's why we put a land use control on
20 it.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Can I ask Terri one more
22 question? I know you've been talking about restoration
23 is one of our main goals.

24 While we're lucky enough to have you here
25 and we're talking about the North Arm, do you have any

1 comments on the restoration as opposed to remediation of
2 the North Arm area, what would happen there?

3 MS. THOMAS: I'm excited to see what they
4 end up with as far as how much -- how much needs to be
5 taken out and then we will be working -- whatever this
6 ends up being, we will be working together to figure out
7 what the grading plan should be to best suit the rest of
8 that environment.

9 Is that --

10 MS. FANELLI: That's exactly right, yeah.

11 MR. BERMAN: A quick question. What's the
12 purpose of mosquitoes?

13 MS. THOMAS: Oh, man. They are so
14 important. I used to work in the Everglades. There
15 is -- they're really a baseline food chain for all
16 aquatic species.

17 That's something that we really wouldn't
18 want to eliminate all mosquitoes for bats and insects.
19 They're just -- they're at the bottom of the food chain.

20 MS. BLUM: The sardines of the air.

21 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. They're just really
22 important. As you go up that pyramid of food chain
23 ladder, they're right there, so it's really important.

24 MS. CHEEVER: About the slope of the North
25 Arm, that would affect whether it would be -- what would

1 be wetlands, what would be riparian area?

2 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. We have a pretty good
3 idea now about the different levels of water and whether
4 it would be wetland or riparian or upland.

5 We should be able to figure that out once
6 we know what's coming out of there.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So is there
8 anything else you need, though? Historical evaluation or
9 anything like that?

10 MS. THOMAS: For the North Arm?

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: For the North Arm.

12 What I'm getting at, once she has her plan
13 and gives that to you, you can act on that pretty much
14 now?

15 MS. THOMAS: What's generally happened is
16 we'll be talking about what's needed for the restoration.

17 That whole tulle removal was done for
18 restoration. The more they know about -- the more we
19 know about what needs to be taken out of the North Arm,
20 then the more we can work together to figure out what's
21 the best ecological benefit to be put back in.

22 Then I'll know more about what we need.
23 Then it's kind of one step at a time.

24 Does that make sense?

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah, it does.

1 Usually when they're done, they're kind of ready to go.
2 There's not a lot of time between backfilling and once
3 the confirmation sampling is okay and you get the go-
4 ahead. Sometimes it's just a few weeks, I guess.

5 MS. FANELLI: Well, probably pre-
6 confirmation sample. We'll know exactly what it is we're
7 digging out before we even start. We'll know where our
8 end stop point is, as well.

9 MS. THOMAS: We meet every two weeks. If
10 there's a grading plan, we generally get to see what that
11 grading plan is and have some -- see if it could be a
12 riparian corridor connected to the lake or if the lake is
13 going to go up further into a wetland.

14 It's hard to know right now. When do you
15 think you'll know how much is --

16 MS. FANELLI: We should know pretty soon.
17 There are some areas where we're taking out a fair amount
18 of sediment, as much as five feet. There's other areas
19 that we're not taking too much.

20 The approximate width is basically right in
21 the channel right down the street from the pipes.

22 So we'll obviously want to regrade it so
23 that it's stable, but also that it provides the
24 functioning for the future long-term plans.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So we know that the

1 North Arm restoration was never funded, so you probably
2 never worked on the restoration out there.

3 MS. THOMAS: It's an odd -- an odd thing.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right. So I guess,
5 you know, we don't want to miss the opportunity if they
6 do excavate. We don't want to miss the opportunity to
7 recontour that to something we want and have them just
8 backfill.

9 MS. FANELLI: We wouldn't necessarily
10 backfill. We would grade to be stable, right. We don't
11 automatically just bring in dirt to bring it back to its
12 current configuration unless that's what the long-term
13 plan is.

14 That's what we're working out. It's
15 unlikely we'll bring back much of anything. We'll
16 probably just try to stabilize the channel so that it
17 flows more freely.

18 If the lake rises, it could potentially
19 back up that way. We'll probably just leave it in
20 stable --

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It sounds like
22 you'll excavate up to the embankment.

23 MS. FANELLI: Not too far. We certainly
24 wouldn't be undermining the freeway.

25 If there is a geotechnical reason to

1 backfill, then we will certainly do that, but I haven't
2 heard from any of the geotechs working on that that
3 there's an issue with what we're doing right now.

4 MS. CHEEVER: If it's not funded, how can
5 you develop a plan or implement a plan?

6 MS. THOMAS: Well, what we have -- the way
7 that funding is working right now is that when they find
8 remediation problems, then they -- whatever's within the
9 ability of the remediation program to do, they'll do so
10 so that it won't impact any future restoration needs.

11 And then whatever we're able to restore
12 right then, we ask for separate funding, so then it's a
13 Trust funded activity to do the restoration after
14 remediation's done.

15 They leave it in the best condition they
16 can under remediation guidelines and then we do what we
17 can.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So what I'm hearing
19 is when they're done, you can work with whatever they're
20 leaving you.

21 Because they'll likely not backfill it all.
22 They'll leave some excavation, recontour and you can work
23 with that.

24 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. They work with us to
25 try to figure out how best it will -- how best within the

1 remediation program they can leave it so that it will
2 support the restoration, and then we come in and try to
3 do the best we can to do a restoration, and it works
4 out -- kind of like two programs, but we mesh in the
5 middle to try to work it out the best we can, so -- but I
6 don't think -- yeah.

7 I think it -- when we find that out, we can
8 certainly let you guys know how it worked out.

9 MS. CHEEVER: I know a couple of
10 neighborhood groups have written letters to the Trust
11 supporting restoration of that area.

12 Does that do any good? Do you need more
13 letters?

14 MS. THOMAS: I don't know. I'm not sure I
15 saw them. That's a different level of engagement.

16 I mean, those are more planning -- that's a
17 planning and higher level of engagement than I am.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any more
19 questions for Terri?

20 Great. Thanks for coming in --

21 MS. THOMAS: You're welcome.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: -- and talking to
23 us.

24 Moving on to item 4B, the progress reports
25 on current activities. Eileen, Presidio Trust.

1 MS. FANELLI: I'll keep it fairly short
2 tonight.

3 You saw that I just sent out the quarterly
4 reports, so you guys got a copy of it, and I can go
5 through it in more detail next month when they take a
6 look at the numbers and the schedule or anything like
7 that and you have questions on it.

8 Mountain Lake is going well. We're
9 actually on schedule. We're removing more than we
10 thought that we would be removing at this point in time.

11 You should start to see the trail closed
12 probably next week and for the next several weeks and we
13 will be off-hauling all the sediment that's currently in
14 the materials handling area.

15 So we're going to take out our first load
16 of dirt, and after that is done, they will repair the
17 area, put out new bags and we will do it again and
18 hopefully that will be complete sometime in September,
19 and then we will be off-hauling again our last load in
20 October and be complete. So that work is going along
21 very well.

22 Caltrans should be doing their pipe
23 cleanout soon, as soon as DTSC issues their approvals.
24 So we're waiting on that, and that's basically all I have
25 for Mountain Lake.

1 MS. CHEEVER: You said removing more than
2 expected. It's not more than you totally expected.
3 You're just getting more out sooner?

4 MS. FANELLI: We got a little more out
5 sooner. We did do confirmation sampling, and based on
6 our confirmation sampling -- I think our RAP said we were
7 going to take out 15,600 yards.

8 We're taking out 18,000 yards. We're
9 taking out a little bit of material based on confirmation
10 sampling. That has been submitted for DTSC for basically
11 approval, but that is our final bottom depth and so
12 that's what we're excavating to at this point.

13 So we're taking a little bit more, and we
14 added some of that to this first phase, so that's where
15 that extra came from.

16 MS. BLUM: Three stories of bags now?

17 MS. FANELLI: Three stories of bags.

18 MR. EPSTEIN: It looked pretty high when I
19 walked by.

20 MS. FANELLI: It's still a bit wet, so we
21 may do a little bit of solidification. We may do
22 something to the top bag to keep us on schedule and then
23 haul it all away as dry.

24 MR. EPSTEIN: Can I ask two questions?
25 It's going out through the golf course.

1 MS. FANELLI: Correct.

2 MR. EPSTEIN: Where does it go after that?
3 Across the bridge; into the City?

4 MS. FANELLI: That's a good question. I
5 don't know. It will get on to Highway 1 by the bridge,
6 and they'll either go north to a landfill if it's going
7 that way or south if it's going that way.

8 If it's going to the East Bay, then it will
9 get itself either through the Presidio and out the
10 Lombard gate and get out that way or on to Doyle and get
11 out that direction.

12 I have to tell you what landfill it's going
13 to and I can't tell you off the top of my head.

14 MR. EPSTEIN: Okay.

15 MS. BLUM: Is it all going to the same
16 landfill?

17 MS. FANELLI: I think it is.

18 There's a very small bit that's classified
19 as Cal Haz and they've been able to isolate that one
20 area, but the rest of it is going out as class II
21 material.

22 So I'm not sure if it's going to Potrero
23 Hill or where it's going, but I can get that information.

24 Okay. We talked about North Arm.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I had a some

1 follow-up questions on that.

2 MS. FANELLI: Okay.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So Caltrans is
4 writing a work plan for the sediment excavation?

5 MS. FANELLI: No. The Trust will write
6 the plan and we'll do the sediment excavation in the
7 North Arm.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Oh, you will?

9 MS. FANELLI: Correct.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: In the eco work
11 plan, it had some language in there saying that we're
12 going to excavate and we're going to do this, but then
13 Caltrans wouldn't do the excavation as part of the
14 stabilization project; right?

15 MS. FANELLI: The only sediment that we're
16 going to excavate is at the very mouth of the pipes so
17 that they have access for their cleanout.

18 So they're not chasing any sediment and we
19 will make every effort to accommodate them. They'll take
20 whatever they have to excavate and haul it offsite.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's a separate
22 work plan by the Trust for the excavation.

23 MS. FANELLI: That is correct.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. And in the
25 eco work plan for the pipeline sediment sampling, you

1 know, they always end every sentence with "if feasible.
2 So we will take a sample 'if feasible.' We will clean
3 the pipe 'if feasible.'" They don't really explain what
4 the conditions of feasible or not feasible is.

5 So I know that it says in there that you
6 and DTSC will be there watching. So I guess we're just
7 trusting that you guys will use your best judgment of
8 what's feasible or not feasible.

9 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. Obviously the Trust
10 is not interested in leaving contamination in those
11 pipes. That's a non-starter from the Trust perspective,
12 as well.

13 We understand that -- that abandoning a
14 pipe in place, a pipe that's active is not an unusual
15 thing to do, right, but we don't want to leave the land
16 use control. We won't accept that.

17 If DTSC doesn't say this pipe, no land use
18 controls, everything's fine, no further action, then the
19 Trust is not going to accept it.

20 So I think when they say "as feasible,"
21 like any good engineer, they're always giving themselves
22 some wiggle room, but I think what we're looking to at
23 DTSC, the Trust is looking to DTSC to help us -- to help
24 us understand if there's going to be controls, then we're
25 going to have to go back to the drawing board with

1 Caltrans.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That was kind of my
3 follow-up question.

4 If they determine they can't sample because
5 the pipe is full of bricks so they can't take a sample of
6 that sediment, then is it presumed to be contaminated?
7 That's an interesting kind of dilemma.

8 MS. FANELLI: I don't know if they won't
9 be able to get a sample. It's not easy, but they can hog
10 it out.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

12 MS. FANELLI: It creates some issues for
13 them. So I'm anticipating that they'll be able to get a
14 sample and see what's going on.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And you'll be
16 witnessing it.

17 MS. FANELLI: We will be witnessing it.
18 Because we won't accept a presumption that it's
19 contaminated if that requires some type of controls into
20 the future.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. That's all I
22 had on the North Arm there.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. FANELLI: So real quick, then, on our
25 other active sites, Baker Beach 1A and 2. You've seen

1 the fences are all up. Maybe you've even seen the
2 temporary bridge that was launched last week, and I got a
3 photograph today of a truck actually going across it,
4 which was pretty darn cool.

5 And so it's functional and they're
6 finishing up some of the ramps on either end, but we're
7 getting ready to start moving contaminated soil on that
8 site, Baker Beach 1A in earnest. So that's exciting.

9 Baker Beach 2, I think the fences just went
10 up this week. I think some fencing was being placed
11 today. I saw an e-mail, and I'm not sure when we'll
12 actually be starting to dig, but I'm hoping it's within
13 the next week or so that we'll be hauling that material.

14 On Baker Beach 1A, as you know, we did
15 perimeter confirmation sampling, so we have a plan in to
16 DTSC for approval that basically says: Here's our
17 lateral limits of excavation. We will be sampling our
18 vertical direction as we remove soil for confirmation."

19 And I'm not sure if we're actually
20 proposing to do any preconfirmation sampling at Baker
21 Beach 2. We're going to go and first remove visible
22 debris and sampling.

23 We should know back, but I'm not sure if
24 we're doing any preconfirmation sampling or not.

25 We have characterized all soil for in situ

1 for disposal. That sampling has occurred. Site users,
2 park visitors.

3 Anything to add, Brian?

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: No.

5 MS. FANELLI: You've probably been out
6 there more than I have.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: I've seen the site, but I
8 have no idea on sampling.

9 MR. BERMAN: Do you have a final budget
10 estimate for Baker Beach 1A?

11 MS. FANELLI: I do. Do you want me to run
12 in and get my cheat sheet?

13 MR. BERMAN: You're going to talk about it
14 next week with the quarterly report, anyway.

15 MS. FANELLI: Next month? Sure. Yeah.

16 MR. BERMAN: But is it really over budget?

17 MS. FANELLI: Baker Beach 1A? No. It's
18 not. Our bids came in under budget, and so we're
19 carrying some good contingencies in the dollars that you
20 see that we're carrying as our complete budget in Oracle,
21 but we'll see because the driver is how many yards of
22 soil we take out.

23 MR. BERMAN: Yes.

24 MS. FANELLI: If we end up going a little
25 bit deeper, then that could radically eat up our

1 contingency.

2 So both of those projects, bids came in
3 below the engineer's estimate and under budget, but we're
4 carrying those contingencies because of the uncertainty
5 and the actual volumes that come off.

6 And then the other sites that we are trying
7 to tick off is Barnard Avenue Protected Range. We
8 haven't awarded the contract yet, but it looks like
9 Maguire Hester is the low bid and we've been working with
10 clarifying some of their means and methods.

11 And we anticipate getting that contract out
12 in the next week or so, and I'm hoping that construction
13 is starting by the last week in July in that area, and
14 that's about a month-long construction.

15 MR. BERMAN: Will there be public access
16 there, then?

17 MS. FANELLI: Not during construction.

18 MR. BERMAN: Afterwards.

19 MS. FANELLI: It doesn't have a trail that
20 goes through it. I imagine tenants and people can walk
21 through it.

22 We will be restoring it -- this is a good
23 example. When we work with Terri's group, we will be
24 restoring it to create a broader swale that has a little
25 bit more meander in it and slows down the water and tries

1 to get a pool that will facilitate some of their future
2 goals.

3 So we'll be changing what it looks like.
4 It probably won't be as walkable as it is today. It
5 definitely won't be as walk automobile as it is today.

6 We also will be doing some final planting
7 at the toe of landfill E that we didn't do last year on
8 purpose.

9 And there won't be any plants actually
10 going in at Barnard Avenue. That was at Natural
11 Resources request, but we will be putting some other
12 plants around the periphery.

13 And then I went through 6B, and that is
14 our -- really our only real open project. Lots of
15 projects have tails and we're responding to comments, but
16 that is the last one I think that will have a public
17 element, public review element to it.

18 MR. BERMAN: I know this is a budget
19 question that we'll take up next month, but what's your
20 estimate now of the total overrun in terms of the
21 difference between what the Army gave and what the --

22 MS. FANELLI: Right now, I would call it
23 in excess of a hundred million dollars in costs that have
24 been reimbursed by Zurich, it's eight million under the
25 RSL. Zurich has paid the majority of it.

1 My monthly reports, quarterly reports go
2 out to everybody, but then a special one goes to Zurich
3 with an invoice attached to it.

4 So that's why there's a little bit of a lag
5 while they make that monthly payment. At this point,
6 there's about seventeen million that they have been
7 invoiced for, the majority of which they've paid.

8 And as you know, we've had long hard
9 conversations with Zurich. So at this point, I don't
10 anticipate them disallowing or arguing too much into the
11 future, but you never know, so -- but so far so good.

12 But we're anticipating still another -- at
13 least another eleven million to fifteen million to be
14 complete.

15 That's a lot to spend between now and May
16 of next year, but our major cost for the construction
17 will come through, because I haven't obviously invoiced
18 them for any construction yet on Baker Beach 1A or Baker
19 Beach 2, because we're just kicking it off.

20 There will be some big bills coming from
21 Mountain Lake because we'll be doing the North Arm. That
22 was cost that wasn't originally anticipated.

23 So there will be some big invoices still
24 coming forward to Zurich.

25 MR. BERMAN: So what do you think -- just

1 ballparking, what's Zurich's total bill going to be?

2 MS. FANELLI: Well, it's a little hard to
3 say because some of the stuff is the unknown sites --

4 MR. BERMAN: Yeah.

5 MS. FANELLI: -- that I don't have
6 separated out in my head.

7 MR. BERMAN: That the Army will pay for,
8 you mean.

9 MS. FANELLI: The Army has. We don't get
10 to double dip. We can't be enriched beyond what it
11 actually costs us. If the Army pays us, we don't get it
12 from Zurich and vice versa.

13 Our total estimate for the program, which
14 includes things that are the known unknowns is at this
15 point about 172 million dollars.

16 That also includes Trust costs that were
17 never to be reimbursed.

18 I think the RSL bill for Zurich seventeen
19 will be close to thirty million, which is what we've
20 always predicted it will be. So it's going to hit about
21 that ballpark when it's all said and done.

22 MR. BERMAN: So the original investment of
23 six million for the policy --

24 MS. FANELLI: Was well worth it.

25 MR. BERMAN: -- seems to be well worth it.

1 MS. FANELLI: Well worth it.

2 MR. BERMAN: We don't know how successful
3 Zurich invested the six million.

4 MS. FANELLI: I hope actually that they
5 invested very well. Because it's better to not -- it's
6 not good to have winners and losers. It's better to have
7 people that win a little bit better than others, but not
8 to have significant losers.

9 MR. BERMAN: All in all, you know, there
10 was a lot of talk when the policy went in that it being a
11 ridiculously high premium, but it looks like it was very
12 well worth it. Six million for the policy and thirty
13 million was returned over about ten years.

14 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Plus the lawsuit.

16 MS. FANELLI: Lawsuits are -- they're part
17 of the territory.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: With insurance
19 companies, probably.

20 Okay. Any other questions for Eileen on
21 project updates?

22 Okay. Moving on to old and new business.
23 RAB final report. I found some guidance on adjournment,
24 dissolution of RABs last night.

25 MS. FANELLI: I saw 1:00 AM.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Sent that out. I
2 guess in 2006, they did a lot of RAB stuff and they put
3 out this guidance that was actually in federal rules and
4 stuff. So I sent it around to the PDF.

5 I read through it. It seems to be -- this
6 is for military bases with military installations, so
7 it's not quite the same as us.

8 MR. BERMAN: There's no analog of the
9 Trust.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But I still am
11 feeling now that it's a formal process, that it's a big
12 decision to make. There's sort of a flow chart and a
13 process here that we might want to consider following.

14 And then right now, I don't really think
15 there's a consensus of members that we're closing this
16 RAB. We've never really talked about it. It's never
17 really come up.

18 So the Trust is proposing or giving its
19 intention that they are going to close or want to close
20 the RAB on May 14th at the end of the --

21 MS. FANELLI: I think we would -- when the
22 remediation is complete or substantially complete, there
23 is some decision documents, there isn't that public
24 input, and then our question would be: What is the RAB's
25 charter at that point? What is the purpose?

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We're estimating
2 that as May next year -- May of this year or May next
3 year?

4 MS. FANELLI: 2014.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: May '14.

6 MS. FANELLI: I think all of our decision
7 documents will be completed before end of calendar 2013.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: From reading the
9 documents, the way it maybe should work is that with your
10 MOAs and MOUs, I'm not quite sure you have the RAB
11 continue with the first place.

12 Was our service part of that equipment or
13 was that solely the Trust on its own?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I haven't checked this
15 since we talked about several months ago. I think it's
16 in the agreement.

17 MS. CHEEVER: Does the agreement
18 perpetuate under the RAB under the same rules as the
19 defense department? So this adjournment procedure should
20 apply or is it voluntary?

21 MS. FANELLI: There's basically a single
22 sentence in the Presidio MOA, which is a document signed
23 by the Trust, the Park Service and the Army that says we
24 will continue public outreach meeting with the RAB as it
25 existed at the time, but it does not cite or perpetuate

1 regulation.

2 It doesn't state that the BRAC regulations
3 or requirements are enforceable or that that's the
4 requirement. It doesn't state that.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So I see it as a
6 memo or a proposal or something comes from the parties in
7 the MOA for whatever that says, we have reached the end
8 of this.

9 Either we want to -- if you look at this
10 guidance, there's two paths, dissolution and -- what's
11 the other one called? Adjournment.

12 Adjournment's sort of a consensus project.
13 We've all voted and decided that we're done.
14 The other one is dissolution where you guys say, "We're
15 done with you. We're closing this."

16 It seems like from the parties and the MOA,
17 you need to put something out for us and decide which
18 path we're going down, whether we're going to do one or
19 the other.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: It would seem to use
21 whether it's by consensus or not. Whether it's been
22 proposed or not is on the table. If the RAB says no, we
23 don't want to adjourn, then dissolutionment becomes a
24 viable option.

25 If the RAB says, "Sure, we're done," it

1 seems to be there's no one contesting the issue, and
2 if -- that's an easier path. I would presume an
3 uncontested approach is easier.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If we all agree to
5 adjourn, we've accomplished what our goals were. Let's
6 all adjourn together.

7 There's some documentation requirements at
8 the end or consideration. There's a report to be
9 written, and so we could do that.

10 To get that started, though, it seems like
11 DTSC, if there's part of your community relations plan or
12 part of your public affairs, they need to be kind of on
13 board to say okay --

14 MS. FANELLI: The consent agreement -- and
15 you all have copies of it -- does not require a RAB. It
16 requires public participation, and there is a public
17 participation plan that was prepared in the past and that
18 we normally, I suppose, operate under, if not even a
19 little bit more.

20 But I think Brian makes a good point. I'm
21 not sure -- I understand that the request for some sort
22 of statement on behalf of the Park Service, the Army or
23 the Trust to -- I think I'd be interested in
24 understanding you guys to have your discussions and
25 understand what you see your role or how that role would

1 he evolve in the future. You know where we are in the
2 program.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: What I'm getting is
4 there is no dissolution of the RAB.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not having read through
6 all those requirements, but what always seems to me the
7 consensual approach is going to be much easier than a
8 contested approach.

9 The requirements -- there have been RABs
10 that have been dissolved by force, essentially.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Oh, yeah.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: And I'm sure there's a
13 very public and essentially contentious process.

14 If this RAB says, "You know, we all agree
15 we're done," if that's the opinion of the RAB --

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Mm-hmm.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: -- then it really would
18 become much more of a formality of how you adjourn the
19 process.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: And it's not much
22 different than what we've been talking about now for
23 several months, and it wouldn't necessarily require an
24 overt action by any of the agencies.

25 Maybe in a formal written process, Eileen

1 writes the letter that you guys all sign or something,
2 but it wouldn't be set up for confrontation.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: If the RAB says, "No, we
5 don't want to adjourn," we should talk about what the RAB
6 wants to do, like Eileen's saying, and see where that
7 fits.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: As far as you know,
9 no RAB member has actually asked to discuss adjournment
10 of the RAB.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: We're talking about the
12 final report --

13 MS. FANELLI: Right.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: -- which will be maybe a
15 precedent to adjournment, but that may be an appropriate
16 discussion to have at a RAB meeting, is the RAB ready to
17 entertain adjournment?

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We call it a final
19 report, but usually final reports are part of the end of
20 the RAB, so --

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: It could be.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We could separate
23 those if you don't want to.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: It wouldn't necessarily
25 be the same day. It could be part of the -- this RAB's

1 got a lot of history and it doesn't all have to end on
2 one day.

3 You could do a final report in December and
4 the RAB could continue until May. That could be part of
5 its -- how it phases out of business.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: If the RAB
7 continues after May, how does that work?

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: What does the RAB do?

9 MS. FANELLI: The question is -- and I
10 think at that point, what will dictate it is what the
11 public participation is and what we have left to do.

12 I couldn't tell you what we have left to do
13 after May. I'm trying to make it as small as possible.

14 Not that I don't like sitting here guys
15 once a month, but I don't get reimbursed for it after May
16 2014. To protect the Trust and the public interest,
17 we're trying to get as much of this done.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: Forgetting about a date,
19 I think the RAB should say as an organization what they
20 want to do.

21 Is there some evolution to a different
22 role, which means it may not be under Eileen's program
23 and it becomes some supporting entity, or is it this
24 group as it was designed is done and the individuals go
25 on?

1 Those are all good questions to try to dig
2 out.

3 MR. BUDROE: Let me ask a hypothetical.
4 What happens if three years from now a whole chunk of
5 contamination gets found that nobody knew about and has
6 to be dealt with?

7 Who in the Trust would deal with that and
8 what would be the mechanism for public involvement, if
9 any?

10 MR. BERMAN: As I understand it, a RAB can
11 be reconstituted at any time at the request of -- that
12 literature that you sent out, which is the military
13 bases.

14 So if something like that was found, the --
15 the Trust and the Park Service can ask for the RAB to be
16 reconstituted.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: And I would say that you
18 could even -- if that scenario played out, there would be
19 a public process because that's required under the
20 agreements that we have, we don't go away in May.

21 They become much less usable because
22 there's much less to do, but they don't dissolve.
23 Because they still address how the three parties deal
24 with that finding three years from now.

25 So the agreement has still has a purpose,

1 and if the RAB said at that point, "oh, my goodness.
2 There's cause for us to come back," whatever process is
3 analogous to the requirements from the BRAC legislation,
4 you could petition the Trust or whatever that mechanism
5 is and re -- redevelop a format that works.

6 MR. BERMAN: It is my understanding from
7 reading those documents that there's no process for which
8 the RAB could take the initiative to reconstitute itself.

9 That would have to come as a request
10 from --

11 MS. FANELLI: I don't think it -- in
12 reading that, I think really where future participation
13 would come, certainly the Trust and the Park Service can
14 voluntary outreach -- keep everybody's e-mail, but it
15 really comes from DTSC, right?

16 Because if we find a big chunk of
17 contamination, John, as you mentioned, that goes through
18 the CERCLA process. There's automatically a CERCLA
19 process to include public outreach at that point in time.

20 So there would be by necessity a public
21 comment period and discussion.

22 Now hopefully we're not going to find that,
23 but there are public bodies I understand that are not
24 called RABs because they're not base closures that do
25 essentially the same thing.

1 If you have large private sector
2 closures --

3 MR. BERMAN: Presumably when all the
4 decision documents have been signed and approved by DTSC,
5 that is sort of an official end of the -- the end of the
6 official duties of the RAB as defined by the BRAC
7 process.

8 So at that moment, the RAB -- its official
9 existence as I understand it comes to an end.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It can transform
11 into something else?

12 MR. BERMAN: It could transform into
13 something else. It would seem to me that the RAB,
14 because that formal oversight or whatever you'd want to
15 call it, participation comes to an end, that the RAB is
16 duty bound to offer an adjournment as a result of
17 completing its duties as formally defined.

18 And what the RAB could say is that we'd
19 like to continue as some kind of public outreach
20 organization and carry whatever expertise that we've
21 developed over the years as a form of public outreach,
22 and the question that -- if the RAB wanted to do that,
23 there's no clear process -- who do we go to?

24 Do we go to DTSC and say, "Yes, we'd like
25 to be formally known as the -- as RAB 2 because we want

1 to participate in the public outreach," and DTSC would
2 then say, "Yes, that's a good idea," or "no, we don't
3 want you to do that" and the Trust and the Park Service
4 are out of it?

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Nobody knows.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think you could ask all
7 the agencies depending on what the scenario is at the
8 time. You'd ask the Park Service, you'd ask the Trust
9 and you'd ask DTSC.

10 You might even ask the Army if that's
11 somehow appropriate, if their involvement is there, and
12 depending on the facts at that time, I would expect that
13 at a minimum, DTSC would entertain your request as a
14 request for public involvement.

15 Because if there's a process that is a
16 public process and there's a request for public
17 involvement, that seems like a pretty good nexus for
18 creating some forum.

19 MR. BERMAN: Right.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Based on community
21 interest.

22 MR. BERMAN: Absolutely. And so the RAB 2
23 would then appeal -- I'm just looking at the process.
24 Would appeal to DTSC to -- DTSC doesn't need to get the
25 Trust approval or the Army approval or anyone's approval

1 to do that, right? Because they are already requested to
2 have public outreach.

3 MS. FANELLI: Right. They approve our
4 public outreach plan. They dictate -- there's a minimum
5 that they have to do by law, but then they dictate based
6 on the community's interest and approve the community
7 outreach plan.

8 MR. BERMAN: Right. So if we thought that
9 we had a reason to continue in some form, we would sort
10 of be an arm of the public -- the public outreach arm for
11 DTSC in a sense.

12 I'm just trying to figure out formally what
13 the transition would be from a BRAC defined exercise into
14 something that is out of BRAC and is then under the --
15 under the guidance, so to speak, of DTSC.

16 MR. BUDROE: We'd probably want DTSC to
17 show up and address that, I would think.

18 MS. BLUM: What's BRAC?

19 MS. CHEEVER: Base Realignment and Closure
20 Act.

21 Do you picture the remediation department?

22 MS. FANELLI: It won't exist as it does
23 today because our mission will have been completed.
24 You've seen our staff is much smaller than when I first
25 got here. That's not by accident. We will have no

1 missions. We will be doing other things.

2 Obviously the Trust will live up to its O&M
3 and obligations. There will not be a remediation
4 department per se.

5 There may be a few things that have to be
6 addressed still. Obviously we're looking at that now.
7 The scope of that work is not known. That is stuff that
8 may linger, and to the extent that there is CERCLA
9 cleanups that fall under the public outreach, there would
10 be public participation.

11 I can't tell you today how much of that's
12 going to go beyond 2014. Again, our design staff will be
13 as minimal beyond 2014 as we possibly can.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: But that's a
15 category you can say. We have these.

16 MS. FANELLI: There will be a handful.
17 Obviously we find things here and there all the time.

18 Do we at all rise to a RAP? No. We find a
19 stray tank, we pull it out of the ground and we close it.
20 There is no public document at all associated with it.

21 But if we found larger sites that are
22 cleanup under CERCLA, there would be the potential for
23 outreach.

24 I do like Brian's suggestion from a
25 consensus base if you think and you talk about what you

1 see your role being as it relates or not to a final
2 report, I think that will be a helpful in any discussion
3 with DTSC or with the Trust or with the Park Service
4 because if you see an involvement, please talk to us
5 about it.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So far Jan Monaghan
7 would like to continue. She likes the RAB. She likes
8 being on the RAB. It's been a good experience for her.

9 MR. BERMAN: But it couldn't continue
10 formally. It's not a legislated group.

11 We could reconstitute ourselves as a public
12 outreach arm associated with DTSC. That's what I was
13 trying to see.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: How about
15 interested in doing that, though personally? Would you
16 vote to do that with Jan?

17 MR. BERMAN: I would have to -- I think it
18 would come as a result of sitting down with DTSC. I
19 don't think you could have a rational decision about that
20 unless you just say, "I can't work with DTSC. They're a
21 bunch of people that I don't trust" or something like
22 that.

23 But if -- that could only result presumably
24 with a discussion with DTSC, and what DTSC's saying that
25 they would think that that is a good idea would be

1 helpful to them, and if such an outcome occurred in
2 discussion with DTSC, I would consider continuing under
3 the -- sort of the aegis of DTSC asking us to be a
4 helpful body for their public outreach.

5 And I would also think that it would be a
6 very good idea if the Trust and the Park Service agreed
7 that that was -- had some value.

8 I also would not want to do that if Brian
9 and Eileen said, "No, we're vetoing that. We never want
10 to see these people again."

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Did I just make
12 this a little more complicated, Julie?

13 MS. CHEEVER: Well, maybe we should talk
14 more about our other thoughts about the final report or
15 not.

16 To get back to you, we just had a committee
17 meeting. We're sort of going in one direction about the
18 final report. We didn't know about this adjournment
19 thing.

20 So when you think about the remediation
21 department adjourning May 2014 -- I'll use that word --
22 you're still thinking of a report that you would have to
23 the -- and you would still like us to have the RAB's role
24 as part of it?

25 MS. FANELLI: I would. I don't have

1 direct guidance from DTSC to show what documentation that
2 we have completed the elements of the consent agreement
3 or the Water Board order, but I've had to do this in
4 other parts of my life in the past, and I'm anticipating
5 a report to DTSC "this is how you told us to do this and
6 this is how we did it."

7 They will agree why, you've done it and so
8 that aspect is done and now the O&M agreement, you're
9 going to maintain things. We have a contingency plan.
10 There's a change. We've done that first bit and now
11 we're in the O&M.

12 MS. CHEEVER: So you're still picturing
13 that you would have a report that you would think it
14 would be good if we contributed?

15 MS. FANELLI: I think it would be great if
16 you contributed to it.

17 MS. CHEEVER: So we started out talking
18 about -- abstractly about adjournment which does require
19 a report.

20 Now we're talking more specifically about
21 the final report and I think we all have to digest a
22 little bit whether -- how our final report, that our
23 little committee started one direction on, whether that
24 would be part of an adjournment report if we did have an
25 adjournment report.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It could go either
2 way. It could be stand-alone. It could be inside
3 adjournment report. The adjournment report is fairly
4 basic and simple.

5 MR. BERMAN: It just says we've done our
6 job.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The middle of the
8 section is our community involvement, which would be our
9 part. It could be used either way.

10 MR. CALLANAN: But the term "adjournment"
11 indicates that you could come back again rather than just
12 final resolve.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

14 MS. CHEEVER: It does to me, that word.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There's provisions
16 in the guidance to reactivate the RAB again should more
17 contamination be found.

18 These are more closing military bases. So
19 you have a reuse agency that's going to build a new
20 development and he finds a lot of new contamination and
21 the Army comes back and opens a new cleanup and they
22 could bring the RAB back.

23 MR. CALLANAN: In that case, adjournment
24 would be better because you could be called back. If you
25 dissolve, then you have to go through a whole new

1 process.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Right. So they're
3 both kind of the same ending. If nothing new is found,
4 they're both done. Essentially once the reuse agency
5 takes the facility like happened here, the RAB would
6 never come back because that's only for military. It's
7 only for the Army, basically, right?

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: There are analogs in non-
9 military.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The DOE has an SS,
11 site specific citizen.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Just like there was a
13 technical review committee before there was a RAB here.
14 There is comparable community involvement avenues for
15 private sites, for public non-military sites.

16 So I think what it's called --

17 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We probably
18 wouldn't come back as a RAB.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think you shouldn't get
20 hung up on the words. I think the facts of the time if
21 that comes will dictate what it's called. It could be a
22 RAB or it could be something else.

23 I don't see that the basic agreements
24 between the Park Service, the Trust and the Army are
25 going away any time in the near future because they do

1 have the discussion of what happened if something is
2 found.

3 So there will be a purpose for those -- at
4 least a reasonably long timeframe, you know, until we
5 know that that's a very low risk of finding stuff. They
6 won't be used hopefully, but they'll be there as a tool
7 to use if necessary.

8 MR. BERMAN: So Eileen, do you anticipate
9 DTSC asking for a final report from you?

10 MS. FANELLI: I do, a small report. I
11 have my intern starting to prepare it now basically just
12 for our own edification to say we're done.

13 I'm checking the orders and making sure
14 that we did everything that the orders say we had to do
15 just to make sure we completed all the work.

16 MR. BERMAN: Would you consider a RAB
17 final report as an appendix to your report?

18 MS. FANELLI: Certainly. I'm open to --
19 what I have to respond to in the consent agreement is the
20 paragraph that says I'm going to have public
21 participation.

22 So I'm going to say we did. We had a RAB
23 and these are the things that we did. These are the
24 meetings that we had, and I can certainly put meeting
25 dates and those types of references in there, but I think

1 it's a great opportunity for you to have your own voice
2 and state how you guys contributed.

3 I like the idea that it's a stand-alone.
4 It's something that we reference. It's something that we
5 append. It could be both.

6 Because I think you are a unique RAB, the
7 time that you've had together, and you should maybe think
8 about this as a transition, write up how you participated
9 to get to this point in time.

10 I don't know whether you would get hung up
11 that that is your death knell, that you're never going to
12 meet again, but think about your future, what have you
13 done to get to here.

14 Now, there's another discussion about what
15 the public involvement is in the future, but I don't know
16 if that should hinder your discussing what you've done to
17 date.

18 MS. CHEEVER: So would it be useful to go
19 over what our committee talked about?

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Well --

21 MS. CHEEVER: Do we want to just say when
22 our next committee meeting is?

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I would say we just
24 go straight to the committee meeting. That's fine.
25 Unless you want to talk about it.

1 MS. BLUM: Actually, I'd like to hear it
2 what was discussed.

3 MS. CHEEVER: A weird thing happened. The
4 reason I was late is I found out I had to come from work,
5 not from home to get here, and I tried to print out this
6 little report that I have, and my -- this laptop didn't
7 communicate with my office, so I couldn't do it.

8 I could e-mail it to you right now and we
9 could print out a copy.

10 MS. FANELLI: Can you send it to me right
11 now? I've shut my computer down.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Do you think it's not worth
13 it. What I'll do is I will open it and I will tell you,
14 and then the first thing I will say is we're going to
15 have another committee meeting specifically to discuss
16 the report on Tuesday, August 6th. That is not a RAB
17 meeting date.

18 Mark is going to be away the next week.
19 Anyhow, that was the date that the three of us agreed to.
20 We don't consider ourselves the only committee. Everyone
21 is welcome to be on the committee. Those are the three
22 of us that showed up. I hope that we will get a lot more
23 done.

24 The three of us that can go. I will send
25 out an announcement, but it will be at 6:30 on Tuesday

1 the 6th. We're hoping possibly Doug might be able to
2 come.

3 So Jan, Mark and I, actually we have a lot
4 of experience on the RAB between us and we also have
5 slightly different perspectives and we try to reflect
6 what would be done here, one idea to quote Jan Monaghan's
7 words, perhaps the most useful for our report to do is to
8 focus on the RAB's contributions and innovations.

9 Not even a whole history of the RAB, but
10 what we've done that's good that might be useful to other
11 people innovations and what we've discussed at meetings,
12 but maybe not made explicit, is we would not want to try
13 to describe the entire cleanup remediation.

14 We would only be describing the RAB's role.
15 We wouldn't want to try to narrate something that we
16 don't even know what was happening.

17 MS. FANELLI: I don't think that would be
18 helpful.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Besides, you would be doing
20 that.

21 MS. FANELLI: That's correct.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Within that, we were trying
23 to think of a format of discussing the RAB, what the
24 RAB's contributions and innovations were, and among the
25 three of us, we thought of some of them, but I would love

1 to have other people mention more.

2 Would it be helpful for us to go over this
3 teeny outline?

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Sure.

5 MS. CHEEVER: So there would -- we would
6 have a timeline, and we were refining this outline. I
7 was picture -- oh, by the way, estimates during this
8 meeting of the length of this ranged from fifty pages to
9 eight pages.

10 MS. FANELLI: Eight max.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Some people on the committee
12 thought maybe we could do this briefly, but the idea we
13 will have little topics, which is an idea that we had
14 more, and a timeline, and as I was putting together this
15 final outline -- Jan did most of it and all three of us
16 discussed it, I sort of thought -- pictured a short
17 introduction, two pages, maybe. Then a timeline that
18 people could refer back to.

19 You'd have a timeline, but -- I'll tell
20 you. The reason why. We want to make sure our report is
21 outstanding and then little interesting topics.

22 One reason we thought we would do this --
23 we would take this approach is we thought it would be
24 helpful to other RABs, but helpful to other citizen's
25 groups that are working with other agencies and

1 organizations.

2 So introduction could have of course
3 establishment of the RAB, what a RAB is, mention what the
4 purpose is to focus on contributions and innovations, and
5 then mention one unique thing about our group obviously
6 was working with the Army and the Presidio Trust in a --
7 something that became a national park.

8 And then a point that we thought of is if
9 you look around the Presidio, there's a lot more open
10 space than there was twenty years ago, and there's also
11 more restored open space. There's more than was
12 envisioned in the Army's original plan, too.

13 And so many groups contributed to that
14 coming about, but the RAB also contributed to that. So
15 that's kind of a nice -- nice thing to think about. Jan
16 was the one who mentioned this.

17 So examples of contributions are that we
18 reviewed dozens of -- commented on dozens of documents.
19 We participated in remedy design and documentation, and
20 that RAB community members sometimes did independent
21 research. The prime spectacular. That's my word, not
22 Mark's word, was Mark's list of unenumerated sites.

23 But there have also been other sites on
24 which our research actually contributed -- at least our,
25 RAB contributed to the body of knowledge and to the

1 ultimate remedy.

2 One example very early before you got here
3 was the Nike missile site, and I would say that -- well,
4 this is something that I happen to know about.

5 We looked into Mountain Lake, both of the
6 lakes 1990s and now the North Arm, and I'm sure there are
7 many other examples where our research actually
8 contributed to the final outcome on the site.

9 You could say that happened on every single
10 one of the sites, but for this purpose, I would recommend
11 just finding the ones where we could say what the RAB
12 did -- really made a difference.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think you can also show
14 that you did that continuously throughout time.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Right.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: So you could say it was
17 not just isolated ones, but thorough and continuous.
18 Something all the way back to when Harold Wall was doing
19 petroleum sites.

20 MS. CHEEVER: That was even before my
21 time.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: And the efforts that he
23 made to really organize the RAB's work with the Army to
24 get the petroleum program underway. You know, which was
25 a big deal.

1 Because the petroleum program initially
2 dwarfed the CERCLA program as the Army tried to minimize
3 the CERCLA program's impact. It was before the Trust
4 became involved, and then negotiations led to the
5 realization that it was a much bigger program.

6 MS. CHEEVER: And did the Army originally
7 not want to do as much with petroleum as they ended up
8 doing?

9 MS. BLUM: I would say.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: They did not start out
11 thinking, oh, yeah, we're just going to rip out the five
12 miles of petroleum pipeline at the Presidio and the three
13 or four hundred tanks. You know, there was --

14 MS. FANELLI: There was plenty.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: Some of those early tank
16 removals, someone closed the hole back up.

17 MS. FANELLI: You have to remember that
18 the Army was not building a national park, either. That
19 was not their mission.

20 So I think the realization that what you
21 brought, one of the things that you brought was the
22 realization of that future vision that aligned obviously
23 with the Park Service and the Trust, but that was what
24 helped catapult the discussion from the Army, because the
25 Army didn't have that vision.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

2 MS. FANELLI: And that was important.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was from the very
4 beginning. That would have been about '93 to '95 period
5 when everything was just getting started. So twenty
6 years ago.

7 MS. CHEEVER: But it was known it was
8 going to be a national park.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was known, but the
10 Army was not used to building national parks. They were
11 used to running military bases, which are different than
12 a national park.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The Army came
14 through a tried and true system that had worked many
15 times in many places before.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: You are back to the point
17 that the RAB's contribution was very tangible.

18 MS. CHEEVER: Mm-hmm.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: And even in hindsight,
20 it's notable at those early stages.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Oh, yeah.

22 MS. CHEEVER: What I'm trying to -- I'm
23 trying to be very cautious and not overdo -- claim credit
24 for things on behalf of the RAB.

25 So I was saying just now as I was looking

1 through a few sites that it's inarguable. You're saying
2 a different thing.

3 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think there are many
4 examples of where the RAB had a very key and instrumental
5 role, and without the RAB's research or active
6 participation at a minimum, the outcome could have been
7 very different.

8 MS. FANELLI: I think that's the key to
9 what Brian says.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Starting with the
11 CRC.

12 MS. FANELLI: One of the other unique
13 things that you have that other RABs or other public
14 groups would like to know about is how did you hold
15 yourself together.

16 That is a really unique feature. It's a
17 combination probably of common interest, but also you
18 have your charters. You have your ways of meeting.

19 You've had your ways of communicating, and
20 those are things that are unique to you and how you guys
21 operated that I think you should reflect on, as well.

22 MS. CHEEVER: That actually is the next
23 chapter -- not chapter.

24 MS. FANELLI: Great.

25 MS. CHEEVER: The way Jan said, this is

1 called innovations. I don't know whether we'll
2 differentiate between innovations and contributions.

3 The charter and bylaws have been used by
4 other RABs, but also -- I can't remember whether the
5 charter started before the Trust came.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: It did.

7 MS. CHEEVER: So it met our needs for
8 working with both the Army and the Trust.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was redrafted.

10 MS. CHEEVER: Then this is Jan's word.
11 Creative use of resolutions to state the RAB's commitment
12 in supporting cleanup, and this was before you came, but.

13 MS. FANELLI: I figured it was before my
14 time.

15 MS. CHEEVER: The landfill closure
16 resolution.

17 MS. FANELLI: That one you did before me.
18 You resurrected it, though, when we were doing 8 and 10.

19 MS. CHEEVER: Then outreach to the general
20 public, and this maybe everyone did, but we did quite a
21 few different things.

22 We had articles in the Army and then the
23 Trust's environmental cleanup newsletter when it existed.

24 At one point, we created fact sheets on
25 individual sites, and then we made presentations at

1 meetings of neighborhood and community organizations, and
2 we also for a time used work groups.

3 Ed and I were on the same work group, which
4 was the small group that he studied and reported back to
5 the whole RAB.

6 And then another category was effectiveness
7 as a community group working with Army, Trust and other
8 agency consultants. One of the use of the inner agency
9 summit meetings to foster communication.

10 MS. BLUM: Very important.

11 MS. CHEEVER: And the other communication
12 was a financial reporting system. I'm not quite sure the
13 creation of.

14 MS. FANELLI: I think it was a public --
15 you know, the Trust always had some type of financial
16 reporting system, obviously.

17 I'm not going to say that it was a great
18 system in the past, but -- I don't have a lot of
19 familiarity with it, but I think you did -- you did
20 further the public disclosure of where the financials
21 were. So they were understandable in a broader sense.

22 MR. BERMAN: I think it was more than
23 that. I think we recognized that the accounting system
24 that we -- that was in place in the beginning was totally
25 inadequate for the project and we insisted to the Trust

1 to -- to modify its accounting procedure so that it was
2 really useful, and I think that's one of the really good
3 things.

4 MS. BLUM: Yeah.

5 MS. FANELLI: And I'm sure you're right.

6 MS. BLUM: I think it was just reporting
7 what had been spent to the best of their ability to
8 report that.

9 I mean, there was no control. I was
10 shocked when I came on board and found out there was no
11 essentially profit/loss statement, no budgeting, nothing.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They never built
13 out the overflow system. They were doing it on an Excel
14 spreadsheet.

15 MS. FANELLI: We do a lot of our detail
16 outside of the system.

17 MS. GEE: To hire the new guy for the
18 financing, you know. It was like six months or
19 something.

20 MS. BLUM: He was supposed to be on board
21 for like six months or something like that. Alan.

22 MS. CHEEVER: So the last thing on this
23 list was we thought it would be nice to have a roster of
24 all past and present community and maybe the years they
25 served, and it could maybe be done -- you do it

1 chronologically, but you also show the years, or you
2 could re-sort it and do it a different way according to
3 the length. And that could include agency members, as
4 well.

5 So as again, we will reannounce the
6 committee meeting on August 6th, but do any of you here,
7 especially those who might not come to the committee
8 meeting, do you like this basic approach and do you want
9 to add any suggestions to the list so we can get your
10 wisdom right now?

11 MR. BERMAN: I personally hope that Doug
12 would contribute to this. He says he would, and I've
13 sent him a couple of e-mails and he's responded to me
14 saying that he would do this.

15 And one of the things that maybe would
16 prompt him, because he was deeply involved for a great
17 many years -- is the particular item that you -- that
18 brought out which was the -- the -- the technical
19 contributions that were made to a number of the projects.

20 A lot of that came out of Doug's effort.
21 And so I think if we said this is going to be a section
22 in this report and tell him that if -- that "you, Doug,
23 are the only person that can bring this and do a full
24 coverage," maybe he would do it. I don't know.

25 I mean, I just think this report, without

1 having some contribution from Doug, would be missing
2 something of value.

3 MS. CHEEVER: Any other suggestions of
4 things that should be included?

5 MS. BLUM: The only other thing that I was
6 interested in besides the financial reporting was the
7 negotiation of the money up-front, which was highly
8 unusual.

9 Usually it was run out of -- base closures
10 run out of the Army, whereas the Trust determined that
11 they would be financially responsible for the final
12 outcome.

13 They negotiated settlement up-front. So
14 that was -- I think that's highly unusual to the best of
15 my knowledge.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: They called it a
17 cashout.

18 MS. BLUM: A cashout.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The Army cashed out
20 and left.

21 MS. FANELLI: We still see them every
22 quarter.

23 MS. CHEEVER: I think we were totally left
24 out of that.

25 MS. BLUM: No, no, no. We didn't really

1 have anything to do with that, but it made the process
2 unique.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We had more to do
4 with it than we realized.

5 MS. BLUM: Well, maybe we did. I don't
6 know.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: You had a dramatic role
8 in the review and comment on the Army's proposed
9 remedies.

10 MS. BLUM: Oh, good. I wondered how that
11 came about. Because I heard Mary Murphy negotiated and
12 she doesn't know squat.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: Not an active role in the
14 negotiations, but some of the impetus I believe that
15 helped drive the Army to the table because they could not
16 just pay their 27 million or thereabouts and put their
17 remedies in place and walk away.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Official control.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was a big thing, but
20 the Trust has spent millions of dollars cleaning up, and
21 they were just going to walk away from.

22 I think it was that involvement with the
23 community, and, you know, if you recall at that time, the
24 RAB selection committees were very -- I believe were much
25 in promoting how will this individual be on the RAB and

1 feed into a group. So it was very much about monitoring
2 a network.

3 MS. CHEEVER: In fact, I left that out. I
4 think that was the only thing I left out, but another
5 point we had was membership recruitment based on needs
6 for area-wide implementation and skills to help RAB
7 community members.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: And representation.
9 Almost every individual was there representing a group.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Like David Sutter.
11 We brought him in. He was a financial consultant.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

13 MS. CHEEVER: By the Sierra Club, more
14 neighborhood groups were represented.

15 MS. CHEEVER: Any other --

16 MS. BLUM: It will be very interesting to
17 read this out.

18 MR. BERMAN: I knew David's brother for
19 the Brookhaven National Laboratory. That was his job.

20 MS. CHEEVER: Do you feature pictures and
21 photos in the report?

22 MS. FANELLI: Oh, yeah. Definitely. I'll
23 have pictures of sites.

24 If you guys have historic pictures or
25 particularly at the RABs at the sites, I think that would

1 be fabulous.

2 MS. CHEEVER: And then we also have -- one
3 RAB member said there's photos of contaminated landfills
4 maybe with the debris sticking out that the Army was not
5 planning to cleanup that the RAB took it -- but we do.

6 There was a nice picture taken of the RAB
7 by a Trust photographer about ten years ago. We have a
8 picture of us now, hoping that our wrinkles don't show.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The one at the
10 Christmas party at the Officer's Club in front of the big
11 fireplace. That would be a good one if we could find
12 that.

13 MS. FANELLI: I can certainly look.

14 MS. CHEEVER: But also if we wanted this
15 to be somewhat self standing for some reason and one of
16 our points is the Presidio now has beautiful open space
17 and we played some small role or large role, maybe we'd
18 have pictures of some before and after of course.

19 MS. FANELLI: Of course. I don't think
20 you should worry about the Trust or the Park Service or
21 the Army. It is in your report.

22 MS. CHEEVER: I want to put pictures in it
23 to make it interesting.

24 MS. FANELLI: I think a picture speaks a
25 thousand words.

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Let's find some.

2 MS. BLUM: I think you're on the right
3 track. I like the idea of the unique, the innovations.

4 MS. CHEEVER: And contributions, yeah.

5 MS. BLUM: Special and the composition of
6 the board in the beginning years to contribute in a very
7 distinct and focused way so you have a lot of talent on
8 the early RAB. Geologists, hydrologists, construction
9 people who really spoke the language, which I still
10 don't, you know, and -- that was my concern when I came
11 on, will fit into any kind of a slope, other than knowing
12 the BMP.

13 But I thought that's probably what's made
14 the RAB probably not as cost-effective as the Trust would
15 have liked it, but I think it's what's made the cleanup
16 as best as it could be, is a knowledge of the language
17 and the process.

18 MS. FANELLI: I don't think -- you should
19 certainly in your charter and your goals, you also
20 participated for a particular reason.

21 You have -- we all have agendas. You had a
22 vision that you wanted to see implemented, and you're
23 talking about it how you contributed, it's how you got to
24 that vision.

25 MS. BLUM: Maybe that's another point too,

1 Julie, is the passion for this beautiful place in one
2 vision or another, but everyone I think shared a long
3 positive association with the beauty of the Presidio and
4 where it was placed and being able to participate even in
5 a limited way, even when the Army was still here, when
6 Crissy Field was a wreck. I mean, It was still a
7 recreational place.

8 So I think that specialness is the thing
9 that really brought the community together behind it.
10 The people of Mountain Lake have been fighting for that
11 for years. They love the place, and I think that's what
12 it takes to last.

13 MS. CHEEVER: That sounds like a nice
14 point to put into the two-page introduction --

15 MS. BLUM: Too many words.

16 MS. CHEEVER: -- to make things
17 interesting.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Well, we're running
19 out of time right now, so -- any closing remarks there?

20 MS. CHEEVER: No, but I hope people will
21 participate -- need to participate.

22 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: August 6th.

23 MS. CHEEVER: Yeah.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

25 MS. CHEEVER: And also -- we should decide

1 how to put adjournment on the agenda in the future.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Let me read that a
3 little bit more.

4 MR. BERMAN: Will you try to get in touch
5 with Doug and --

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I was in touch with
7 him up until lately. He's moved recently and seems to be
8 in transition. So I'm not sure --

9 MS. CHEEVER: I wrote him a note inviting
10 him to the August 6th meeting. And he actually wrote me
11 before that saying he would be --

12 MR. BERMAN: He said he would do things,
13 but if you point out there's a section in the report.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Cross our fingers
15 for him. He's in transition. We don't know where he's
16 headed to right now.

17 MR. BERMAN: Doug is always in transition.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. Okay?

19 MS. BLUM: One suggestion, Julie, on
20 these -- it is summertime and we have what I would call
21 limited attendance at the RAB meetings, and maybe sort of
22 like a personal reach out to people to attend this
23 meeting would be a good thing rather than broadcast
24 message. Just a suggestion.

25 MR. BERMAN: You mean a committee meeting.

1 MS. FANELLI: You have expertise in this.
2 Please show up. Here's your assignment.

3 MR. BERMAN: This is for the committee
4 meeting on August 6th. Where does it take place?

5 MS. CHEEVER: It's going to be at my
6 house. I'll say this in the message.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: So I'm going to
8 miss the August RAB meeting.

9 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. I will have to miss
10 that, too. I'm going to be out of town.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's usually low
12 attendance. We can either cancel and skip that meeting,
13 or if people are interested, they can go ahead and try to
14 hold it, too.

15 MS. FANELLI: Just let me know.

16 MS. GEE: How about shifting your
17 committee meeting from the 6th to the 13th?

18 MS. CHEEVER: The problem is Mark won't be
19 there, and there's other dates that Jan will be away.

20 MR. BERMAN: I'm going to be away.

21 MS. CHEEVER: Some people suggested there
22 could be a site tour on the 13th.

23 MS. FANELLI: Tour of?

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: 1A and 2.

25 MS. BLUM: Baker Beach? Instead of having

1 a RAB meeting, just have a site tour.

2 MS. FANELLI: Just send me an e-mail and
3 I'll work with the construction managers to set something
4 up.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: What's the feeling
6 here? Have a meeting?

7 MR. BERMAN: I'm going to be out of town.

8 MS. CHEEVER: I think a site tour would be
9 nice.

10 MS. BLUM: That will be fun. Hot toddies
11 as a tour.

12 MR. BERMAN: August, it will still be
13 daylight until eight o'clock or quarter after 8:00. So,
14 I know --

15 MS. CHEEVER: What do you think, John?
16 You have a long commute.

17 MR. BUDROE: I probably wouldn't wind up
18 going.

19 MS. GEE: It's still light out.

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Seven o'clock site
21 tour.

22 MS. FANELLI: I'd rather do it earlier.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: Check with them and see.

24 MS. FANELLI: If we set it up for 6:00
25 when they're starting to wrap up, you will probably at

1 least see the equipment.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Why don't you send out an
3 e-mail saying that that's what the plan is and asking
4 people to respond and say it will be held if at least --

5 MS. FANELLI: It would be nice to know how
6 many so I don't get everybody all geared up.

7 MS. CHEEVER: So there would be the
8 minimum that would make this worthwhile.

9 MS. BLUM: Ten?

10 MS. FANELLI: Ten's a lot.

11 MS. BLUM: RAB members?

12 MS. FANELLI: Brian doesn't count because
13 he sells it all the time.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Cancel the meeting
15 in August and replace it with the site tour depending on
16 attendance. If we get five people to commit.

17 MS. CHEEVER: So an e-mail should be sent
18 out saying this.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm going to cancel
20 the RAB meeting in August. Agreed?

21 MS. FANELLI: That's fine.

22 MR. CALLANAN: We're not going to adjourn
23 it.

24 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Traditionally had
25 really low attendance, anyway.

1 Okay. Anything other comments? So we'll
2 put off the quarterly report till September.

3 MS. FANELLI: September's fine.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Great. Without
5 objection, meeting adjourned.

6 (The meeting concluded at 9:08 PM).

7 ---o0o---

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2013

BUILDING 67

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

1 ATTENDEES

2 RAB Members:

3 Mark Youngkin, Facilitator

Eileen Fanelli

4 Brian Ullensvang

Gloria Gee

5 Toni Kramer

Edward Callanan

6 Jan Monaghan

Jan Blum

7

8

9

---o0o---

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

of the Meeting, and on September 10, 2013, 7:07 PM at

Building 67, Presidio of San Francisco, California,

before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 5527, State of

California, there commenced a RAB meeting under the

provisions of the Presidio Trust.

---o0o---

1	AGENDA	
2		Page
3	1) Welcome and Introductions - Mark Youngkin:	4
4	2) Agenda Discussion and Approval:	4
5	3) Announcements:	4
6	4) Discussions & Presentations - Eileen Fanelli	
7	A. Quarterly report	5
8	5) Old/New Business:	
9	A. RAB Final Report - Jan Monaghan	36
10	6) Public Comment - None	
11	7) Action Items and Agenda Items:	50
12	8) Adjournment:	52
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Welcome to the
2 regularly scheduled meeting of the Restoration Advisory
3 Board, Presidio of San Francisco. We're back after our
4 summer recess. I hope everyone had a good vacation.

5 MS. MONAGHAN: We did.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Does everyone have
7 an agenda? Any discussion, additional topics, et cetera?
8 Seeing none, agenda approved.

9 Any announcements?

10 MS. BLUM: Unrelated to the RAB, but the
11 Presidio Trust will be having an open house on the 23rd
12 for everyone who is interested in what happens next to
13 the commissary, and the public meeting starts at 6:30 and
14 it's primarily going to be presentations by the three
15 finalists, and those include the Parks Conservancy, CORA
16 who wants to build a research center for sustainability
17 at the commissary, and George Lucas, who would like to
18 build a private collection art museum named the George
19 Lucas Art Museum on the Presidio.

20 I think the meeting starts at 6:30 and
21 probably will be over at eight o'clock. It's probably
22 going to be at the Golden Gate Club, probably.

23 MS. FANELLI: Or will it be at the --
24 observatory?

25 MS. BLUM: Observatory.

1 MS. FANELLI: I thought it was at the
2 observatory.

3 MS. BLUM: I can't remember, but if you're
4 interested, I will look it up.

5 MS. FANELLI: I'm sure it's on our week
6 page.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: I will be going.

8 MS. BLUM: Oh, you lucky thing. That's my
9 announcement.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Thank you, Jan.
11 Moving on to topic number 4, discussions and
12 presentation. We have A, the quarterly report by Eileen
13 Fanelli.

14 MS. FANELLI: It is the quarterly report
15 time.

16 Okay. So this is through June of this year
17 and you all received a copy in the mail or the e-mail,
18 and I will go over our milestones, cost schedule and some
19 program specifics.

20 So I'm -- I think I'm shorting us --
21 because I did this rather quickly -- our milestones, but
22 we have been hitting a lot of milestones, and last
23 quarter, we got the Final Remedial Action Plans approved
24 and the Remedial Action Work Plans for Baker Beach 1A and
25 Baker Beach 2 and construction started and last month,

1 you got to see --

2 MS. BLUM: Right.

3 MS. FANELLI: Got to see it, and I have a
4 couple pictures in here.

5 We also got direction from DTSC on
6 responding to the -- I like to call them the tail end
7 items.

8 This is the 1999 IT miscellaneous sites
9 report and a few other sites that were identified since
10 the consent agreement was issued in 1999, and we have
11 made some progress on that.

12 We have submitted evaluation reports for
13 slag dump and bluff skeet range, which were addressed by
14 the sequester address, and we are working on others.

15 MS. BLUM: Where is the slag dump?

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's the sand dunes.

17 MS. BLUM: Oh, really? And the skeet
18 range?

19 MS. FANELLI: That was actually just north
20 of the CHP range. It was the slope, basically.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: They fired off where the
22 picnic area was at the CHP was out over the bay.

23 MS. BLUM: Oh, great.

24 MS. FANELLI: So there's two documents
25 that we submitted, and the Trust has asked on the data

1 evaluation for no further action on both sites.

2 MS. BLUM: Eileen, does that include water
3 cleanup? It doesn't; does it?

4 MS. FANELLI: No.

5 MS. BLUM: Whose venue is cleanup of the
6 water for those bullets?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: They would use shot.

8 MS. BLUM: Shot, okay.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: But for the Crissy Field
10 range, which goes right on the water, the Army retains,
11 and that's the exact geometry where the Trust ended and
12 the Army picks up is defined in the agreements.

13 MS. BLUM: Okay.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There was a skeet
15 cleanup off Crissy Field.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. It went out to the
17 line.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: In 2000.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: So anything that's left
20 out in the water that could be found would be the Army's
21 responsibility.

22 MS. BLUM: Okay.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's very
24 unlikely.

25 MS. FANELLI: DTSC has closed the site and

1 I don't know who ultimately has jurisdiction if there was
2 significant contamination in the water.

3 MS. BLUM: What is slag? Isn't that
4 metal?

5 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. It's like from a hot
6 furnace.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Cinders.

8 MS. BLUM: Incinerators. Okay.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's uncertain.

10 MS. FANELLI: So the source of that
11 material is not really known, but the investigation that
12 was completed including collecting several samples and
13 none of the samples had any exceedences of any cleanup
14 number.

15 So there's clingers on the sand dune and
16 it's really not clear where they came from, but they
17 don't appear, based on the data, to pose any
18 environmental or human health risk.

19 There's other sites that we are working on.
20 The 1999 IT report, if you remember that one in
21 particular, Mark's name is obviously mentioned because it
22 started with the Youngkin list.

23 IT did another review of historic records and
24 came up with a list that is inclusive of the Youngkin
25 list, essentially.

1 And so what DTSC has asked us to do is
2 basically run all of those to ground. So there's like
3 500 and a handful of buildings or areas, and we have
4 culled through that to identify what are addressed in the
5 consent agreement or Water Board order and looked at the
6 IT research and conducted whatever additional work we
7 felt was necessary on the remainder of those sites.

8 That report is not published yet. It's
9 coming out in three pieces. There's the -- the building
10 644, which the Trust did -- accelerated because we have a
11 tenant who has moved in there.

12 It will be area A site separated and area B
13 site, and we're really still working on both of those.

14 I'm hoping that they would be out within a
15 month, and of course as soon as we both them, we'll let
16 you guys know.

17 We also began Phase II dredging at Mountain
18 Lake. Mountain Lake is ongoing, as well. That was some
19 of our CERCLA milestones.

20 Under petroleum, we had one other sort of
21 cap activity at the 207/231 site. That was to do soil
22 vapor monitoring at building 228 which we completed, and
23 at this point, we have received concurrence and closure
24 of all the tanks that have been submitted.

25 So Water Board has closed all of the tanks,

1 except those of course that we haven't discovered yet, at
2 the Presidio.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Presidio-wide?

4 MS. FANELLI: Presidio-wide.

5 MS. BLUM: Wow.

6 MS. FANELLI: All the tanks are closed.

7 Agnes has been really busy. The only thing
8 is the review of the FDS reports that we submitted a
9 while ago. I think they're long and cumbersome.

10 So she's avoided them to a certain extent,
11 but hopefully we'll be working on them soon.

12 So the only real open site there is 207/231
13 where we've completed the remediation. We have submitted
14 a Preliminary Draft Construction Completion Report, and
15 we'll hopefully be getting that as a formal submittal
16 soon, and -- and we're doing water monitoring at 207/231.

17 Not on here that I can give you a little
18 description of is building 637. That area was closed by
19 the Water Board, the cleanup of building 637 area I think
20 back in 2008. It was right after I get here. 2007,
21 2008, 2009.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: The cap was done in 1999
23 or 2000.

24 MS. FANELLI: Real early.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's the one the RAB

1 participated in.

2 MS. FANELLI: So Caltrans has found some
3 additional petroleum there and we did a little phase of
4 investigation working with Agnes.

5 And so we are doing a quick nother round of
6 soil removal. It's all in the Caltrans TCE, but I'm
7 hoping that we'll be doing that likely in the November
8 timeframe, and we do have big documents.

9 It's a big enough deal that we're sending
10 out big documents and working with the Flat Iron, the P3
11 contractor to get out there and remove some of that
12 additional material.

13 The way it was discovered is Caltrans is
14 looking for areas to do their mitigation wetland
15 development, and so when they were -- they were potholing
16 and looking at an area we had identified for wetland
17 expansion, they found some residual petroleum.

18 So -- so we didn't expect that, but we're
19 rising to the occasion and adding that to the to-do list
20 for things that must be completed before May of 2014.

21 And then on lead-based paints, we continue
22 to work through those with DTSC. As a matter of fact, we
23 are meeting with DTSC tomorrow on --

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: Thursday.

25 MS. FANELLI: Thursday.

1 MS. BLUM: On lead-based paint, do you --
2 I apologize. It's probably on the construction report.
3 Are there very many sites left? I would think that we
4 would be almost completely --

5 MS. FANELLI: We're getting pretty close.
6 We have submitted for closure over 600 buildings, and
7 DTSC has closed a little over 300 of them. So DTSC's a
8 little bit backed up.

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MS. FANELLI: Of the remaining buildings,
11 many of them are special. They're demolished. They are
12 play areas. They're -- they're not buildings, per se,
13 and so the conversation we're having with DTSC in essence
14 is these don't fit the prescriptive plan --

15 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

16 MS. FANELLI: -- and how should we handle
17 them.

18 That said, it seems like we maybe have as
19 many as 150 still outstanding, but I think many of them
20 will be taken care of because they're buried structures,
21 like buried magazines. There's no exterior wall, even.
22 Maybe an access hatch.

23 So those are the things that we're working
24 through, and on Thursday, we're going to talk more with
25 DTSC about our approach for those.

1 So yes --

2 MS. BLUM: When you say "play areas," are
3 you talking about children's play areas?

4 MS. FANELLI: Not really. They're lawns.
5 The Army -- they've been called play areas, but they're
6 the lawns between buildings.

7 So when we cleaned up the building and we
8 have clean on either side, there's no reason necessarily
9 to think that there's a problem in between.

10 In some places, we have sampled and we've
11 shown there is no problem in between. So we're working
12 through those to associate them really with the building
13 that they're even with.

14 If there's lead-based paint with the
15 building, we would just keep going till we cleaned it all
16 up as there wasn't really a defined source for lead in
17 those lawn areas.

18 I should go get my -- my actual copy of the
19 report that's in my office there.

20 But we are getting -- the dollars show that
21 we're getting close. We're still estimating 172 million
22 by the time we're done.

23 There's some things that you see in there,
24 but where there's contingencies in some sites, there's
25 always pressure on other sites.

1 For example, Mountain Lake. We're going to
2 be doing the work there and I still don't have the dollar
3 amount on that, but we're working on it.

4 637 was surprise, so we had to add some
5 money into that, so I'm still thinking this number is not
6 a bad number for us.

7 We have been -- continuing to invoice
8 Zurich and they have been making payment. So that's the
9 money that we're basically relying on.

10 Oh, I think Alan made a booboo. I think
11 one of these should be Baker Beach 1A and one of these
12 should be Baker Beach 2. I don't know which one is
13 which.

14 I'm going to say the first one is probably
15 Baker Beach 1A, but they obviously have been what we've
16 been focusing on along with Mountain Lake. So that's
17 where most of our dollars are.

18 We are still doing a fair amount of lead-
19 based paint and soil work. Letterman, we're doing all of
20 the homes -- or the buildings on O'Reilly -- O'Reilly.
21 O'Reilly Street.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think so.

23 MS. FANELLI: And those clapboard
24 buildings with a lot of paint on them. So the paint and
25 soil extended pretty far from the buildings. So that was

1 sort of a major cleanup. Each of those buildings was
2 sort of north of a hundred thousand dollars. So that's
3 why we have a high number there in Letterman.

4 207/231 reflects the completion of -- the
5 structure completion of that initial drafting and the
6 soil vapor work that we did.

7 And of course DTSC keeps billing us, but
8 they have been very responsive, so that's the DTSC
9 invoice on there.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: Can I ask about the Baker
11 Beach numbers?

12 MS. FANELLI: Mm-hmm.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: It seemed like -- I think
14 that you're close to being done there, right?

15 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: Cumulative to date is a
17 third of the budget?

18 MS. FANELLI: No. We're going to come in
19 under budget for -- we are carrying a million dollars --
20 about -- in contingency.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

22 MS. FANELLI: Close in total on each site.
23 So we will be coming in under on both of those, but we're
24 likely going to be spending more at Mountain Lake.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: Neither of these would

1 include the construction?

2 MS. FANELLI: Most of the construction
3 numbers are not in there yet.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: You didn't mobilize until
5 late June so we wouldn't have any bills for the
6 construction.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: Thank you. My clock is off
8 here.

9 MS. FANELLI: Although we've been -- we've
10 been working with our contractors -- because it's
11 important to us, in order to get the funding from
12 Zurich -- to get the bills out quickly.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

14 MS. FANELLI: So I could go pull the
15 detail sheets, but I believe that we're going to have
16 about 800,000 under on Baker Beach 2 and 1A, but I'm not
17 sure what it is.

18 But then on Mountain Lake, I may be over by
19 a million because I have to add north arm and we have
20 additional sediment after the confirmation sampling.

21 So that's going to push that one up.
22 That's what I mean it kinds of washes. We do our best
23 guess on some of these things.

24 It's kind of shocking that we have spent
25 three million in DTSC oversight.

1 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

2 MS. FANELLI: And this is just a snapshot.
3 So we're getting close to finishing. This is also
4 carrying some of the unknown sites.

5 Quite frankly, I think that those are
6 complete budget wags in terms of our estimate, and many
7 of them will not cost what we have budgeted.

8 MS. BLUM: Eileen, if our budget report is
9 three months behind, how far behind is your billing and
10 receipt file?

11 MS. FANELLI: The quarterly report is
12 behind, but I send an invoice out monthly. So I have --

13 MS. BLUM: So it just rolls through the
14 pipeline.

15 MS. FANELLI: Yeah. It's just that it's
16 not in this paperwork. I know exactly where we stand
17 every month.

18 We update our estimates to complete, our
19 estimates at completion monthly. I send an invoice to
20 Zurich on the 15th of every month. So I know precisely
21 every month where we are spent.

22 MS. BLUM: Okay.

23 MS. FANELLI: In terms of schedule and
24 status, you know, the groundwater analysis, I keep
25 telling you this. I've been through it now twice and

1 Genevieve has been through it. It's just about ready.

2 I have to follow up with Ryan to send it on
3 to Brian. That's the next stop, but it's basically been
4 completed at this point.

5 Brian will get his chance to review it and
6 give us comment and then we'll be turning it in to DTSC.

7 And the request will be stop monitoring and
8 to then abandon the wells.

9 Well abandonment is a covered cost, and to
10 the extent we can document that we don't need these
11 wells, it's to our benefit to abandon before the policy
12 period is over.

13 Fillsite 1 and 2, we had requested to stop
14 monitoring. DTSC asked us to do one quarter more. We
15 did one quarter more.

16 We updated our report. DTSC approved it
17 and we are moving forward now to abandon those wells.

18 Landfill E is just in post-closure mode and
19 that's where we're at. We don't anticipate requesting
20 stopping any of the post-closure and the activities in
21 the next year. Potentially landfill gas. We'll see.

22 Mountain Lake, we're in the Phase II of
23 remedial construction, so we have one -- the first layer
24 of bags, I believe, are full and they're getting ready to
25 start stacking the additional bags.

1 We have been working hard on determining
2 the best way to excavate the north arm. There's only
3 about 1,200 yards, but because of access, it's looking
4 very costly.

5 So we're -- of course we're not in a
6 competitive bid situation, so it makes it a little bit
7 harder for us to negotiate with the contractor and try to
8 noodle that into a number that I can have third party
9 engineers say yes, that is reasonable and stamp.

10 But it's going to be tough getting that
11 material out and we're hoping to begin on it soon.

12 We are looking at overall probably not
13 being out of Mountain Lake until the end of the calendar
14 year.

15 We're hoping to be out of the water in
16 November, but we still then have a laydown area to
17 restore and what not, so let's hope we don't have too wet
18 an October.

19 Although I did look at Farmer's Almanac and
20 I saw three inches of rain predicted, which is above
21 average, but I saw a dryer and normal November and
22 December.

23 I don't know if Farmer's Almanac is
24 reliable.

25 Baker Beach 1A, I got a few pictures I can

1 show you in a minute and Baker Beach 2, but we're
2 backfilling both sites, and the site walk at Baker Beach
3 2 is phenomenal.

4 We'll probably be there next week messing
5 with the fences and taking things like that care of, and
6 Baker Beach 1A till the end of the month.

7 Fillsite 6B, we're working actually very
8 quickly. So the guidance we have gotten from DTSC is to
9 complete a preliminary endangerment assessment and that
10 is how we have structured all of the RI work to date.

11 We are going to be asking for no further
12 action with an LUC and that is the anticipated remedy
13 for.

14 For fillsite 6B. I am hoping that actually
15 DTSC will come to the October meeting and will do a more
16 formal presentation on it because when they decide that
17 they're going to adopt it, then they do a public notice,
18 and so they would update the RAB next month on that
19 before they issue it for public review.

20 So we're working on that.

21 I have a few pictures of BAPR.
22 Construction is underway. We can talk a little bit about
23 that when I get to the photos.

24 MS. BLUM: On RAP 6B, wasn't that an area
25 with PAHs? Wasn't that a -- we haven't done work on 6B,

1 have we?

2 MS. FANELLI: We haven't done removal
3 work.

4 MR. ULLENSVANG: 6A was the one.

5 MS. FANELLI: Thompson's Reach. Is that
6 what they call it?

7 MS. BLUM: And 6B is near the Field
8 Nurse's Hospital?

9 MS. FANELLI: Yes.

10 MS. BLUM: That was not full of toxic
11 material?

12 MS. FANELLI: There's building debris, but
13 based on our analysis, it's safe in its current
14 configuration.

15 It's under pavement or parking or under
16 buildings, and we are proposing a land use control to
17 address two instances, one block where the Swords to
18 Plowshare is the next step and the Ptemp is identified
19 for residential.

20 MS. BLUM: Right.

21 MS. FANELLI: So we have a land use
22 control to ensure that if and when any additional
23 residences are developed, that it remains protective.

24 And then the other area is to the north and
25 that is where Crissy Marsh might -- will be built. Not

1 Crissy Marsh, but the Quartermaster Reach will be built
2 in the future.

3 In that area, we have a land use control,
4 as well, to manage that portion of fillsite B and ensure
5 that it's protected.

6 But in its current configuration, the
7 site -- based on our analysis, and this is what DTSC will
8 respond to, doesn't pose any eco risk.

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MS. FANELLI: Crissy Field RAP. Building
11 937. Building 937. That is the building --

12 MS. BLUM: Again.

13 MS. FANELLI: We've submitted the site
14 certification for that building. We just haven't heard
15 back. I think that's the same as last quarter, from
16 DTSC.

17 207/231 we talked about. We're doing our
18 groundwater monitoring. That area again will be kind of
19 turned over by the Doyle work.

20 But we did the soil cleanup. So anything
21 that they're going to be removing we'll obviously watch
22 because it's still an open site, but we don't -- we
23 anticipate maybe they'll find mini pockets of stuff here.

24 We've been finding tiny pockets of
25 petroleum and slightly sticky area in the whole Crissy

1 area that makes sense. Not surprising.

2 And then Lobos Creek, we submitted the
3 Response to Comments Summary RI reports. We're just
4 waiting for DTSC to say, "Yeah, it's good" or give us any
5 additional comments we might have.

6 Here's my lead-based paint comments. 627
7 have been submitted. 313 has been formally closed, and
8 we are carrying about 800 or so on our to do list, but
9 those -- most of the runs that remain are odd buildings.

10 That said, there still had a handful of
11 buildings that we may not do. They're mainly like
12 warehouses, things where the exterior paint is not
13 stabilized or in areas that are paved that we may not get
14 done before the end of the policy period.

15 In many cases, the stabilization of the
16 building is more costly than the cleanup of the lead-
17 based paint around it, and because of the flexibility we
18 have, the Trust is -- is -- in terms of how we work with
19 potential tenants, we can require tenants to take on a
20 building not only to stabilize the paint, but also to do
21 whatever cleanup around it.

22 So there's not very many of these. I'm
23 going to say ten. I couldn't give you a list right now
24 off the top of my head, but they're either very small
25 buildings or sheds. There's a handful of sheds that the

1 Trust may tear down, anyway.

2 There's a few buildings like along
3 Thornburg that we just haven't finished because we don't
4 have a developer or developed use for them yet. That
5 won't be -- won't be done.

6 And that doesn't mean the Trust still
7 doesn't have responsibility for them.

8 MS. BLUM: Eileen, with regard to the
9 reuse of the commissary -- I may have already asked this
10 question. I'm sorry if it's a repeat.

11 But if there is water -- there is a water
12 feature work that is done at the commissary, as some of
13 the users have planned, and they discover more
14 contamination, whose responsibility is that if we've
15 already passed May 2014?

16 In other words, the commissary foundation
17 may be ripped up depending on what kind of a plan is in
18 place and the footprint made smaller and more water
19 added, more water added.

20 Then whose responsibility would it be if
21 there was new contamination found on the site?

22 MS. FANELLI: Well, there's land use
23 control on the site. So there's some anticipation that
24 you might find something that would require additional
25 cleanup, particularly if you were trying to specifically

1 create wetlands. There's specific prohibition unless
2 there's further evaluation that shows that it's clean.

3 If -- if that discovery happens before May
4 2014, then we would probably reopen.

5 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

6 MS. FANELLI: To the extent that -- it's
7 actually -- I'm going to take the statement back. It's
8 not that simple of a question.

9 It depends on whether or not under the RSL
10 policy, once a site is closed, and the site has been
11 closed, at least the Water Board has closed it.

12 DTSC still -- Bob has not sent site
13 certification for the RAP 3 sites that are within the
14 footprint of commissary PX.

15 So depending -- so it's not technically
16 closed by them. So if it's not technically closed and we
17 could tie it to CERCLA, then we would probably go back to
18 Zurich and try to do it, but I think it would be
19 negotiated --

20 MS. BLUM: Mm-hmm.

21 MS. FANELLI: -- with the developer.

22 It's after the policy period. So it would
23 be the Trust that would pay for that.

24 MS. BLUM: I know that boards were done in
25 the floor of the commissary and it determined that that

1 floor would be the cap. So if that floor comes up, I
2 guess well, we'll see when we get there.

3 MS. FANELLI: Right. The requirements are
4 under the land use control, and you can see -- you just
5 need to have a barrier between the fill soils, the soils
6 that are left and human contact.

7 So they can do that variety ways. Paving,
8 landscape soils.

9 MS. BLUM: Okay.

10 MS. FANELLI: Hardscape.

11 Same with the wetland development. If the
12 material, the fill, whatever is exposed doesn't meet the
13 eco criteria, they can over-excavate it and put another
14 barrier in there, as well, clean sand or whatever would
15 be appropriate for that habitat, and that would also
16 work.

17 But there's no expectation that the land
18 use control would necessarily go away even in the future
19 after development of a museum or whatever it becomes.

20 MS. BLUM: Right.

21 MS. FANELLI: So next quarter's activities
22 are the continued race to the finish line for all the
23 items that are not done.

24 Certainly we want to complete the
25 construction at all of our main sites this September if

1 we can, and the two sites that will continue to be in
2 construction is Mountain Lake and our 637 area.

3 But I'm anticipating 1A and 2 and BAPR will
4 be buttoned up before the end of the month.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: They'll be planting.

6 MS. FANELLI: Right. We do have planting
7 there, 1A, 2, and we'll have planting at E, the toe of E,
8 BAPR.

9 That's sort of overlap area, a place that
10 we didn't plant purposely because we knew we were going
11 to be in there this season. So I think that's where our
12 major planting is going to occur.

13 MS. BLUM: I was by there today and it's
14 terraced and cleaned up and completely locked off for
15 access.

16 MS. FANELLI: BAPR?

17 MS. BLUM: Yes. It's definitely under
18 construction. It looks like it's almost finished.

19 MS. FANELLI: We're get getting there.

20 In terms of BB 1A activities, basically
21 we're trying to secure the site now. I believe most of
22 the placement of soil is complete. There needs to be
23 grading in the north.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: It should be. I was
25 under the impression it was going to be done by now.

1 MS. FANELLI: The grading is probably
2 complete and they're beginning to put down the erosion
3 control materials, and we'll plant in November, and we do
4 have an RFP that's been prepared -- I don't know if it's
5 been issued yet, but we're in the process of soliciting
6 the contractor, the landscaper or a planting contractor
7 to do that work.

8 And there's a picture of the site.

9 MS. BLUM: Wow. So big.

10 MS. FANELLI: Brian, you might actually
11 have a better sense of timing for most of these.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: Recent.

13 MS. FANELLI: After the excavation was
14 done and it was as they were starting to bring in soil.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: Because it was after they
16 had removed the soil. This was within the last week, I
17 would imagine.

18 MS. FANELLI: I think a lot of these are.
19 We had a lot of challenges compacting the soil, because
20 the pile was a little above moisture content. I have a
21 pictures of the dump truck putting it in.

22 We put in these additional screens on the
23 fence to try to be more protective of low lying dust for
24 the Golden Gate Bridge District, and I think that PVC,
25 that must be for them to keep the soil moist.

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's a water system so
2 they can have water for the dust control.

3 MS. FANELLI: So here's a dump truck. It
4 backed over the bridge and it's not the brightest
5 picture, but dumping dirt, and it is being moved around.

6 You can see some of the tracked soil in the
7 foreground and some of the hay, the straw that's being
8 placed and fabric goes on top of that.

9 There is the little compactor guy placing
10 soil.

11 MS. BLUM: That has to be one of the
12 noisiest jobs they ever get to work on.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think they've had three
14 sunny days.

15 MS. FANELLI: I don't think these guys
16 enjoyed the weather. Very windy, very cold, very wet and
17 foggy.

18 There's the fabric going down and there's
19 some waddles that will be placed. So yeah, I think it
20 will look hopefully very nice when it's done.

21 MS. BLUM: It's so different to see the
22 land graded right up to the top of the Battery, so it's
23 just absolutely flat. Really makes them stand out.
24 That's pretty spectacular site.

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

1 MS. FANELLI: I have a few of Baker Beach
2 2. We're basically on the same schedule there. We'll be
3 out of there, the fences -- maybe a week, week and a half
4 before the fences at 1A.

5 I think this was a picture as they were
6 excavating the waste. I don't think all the waste was
7 out yet.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: That looks early.

9 MS. FANELLI: It was early on. Bjorn gave
10 me what I asked for, which was give me the sequence, and
11 I didn't get exactly the same thing from Ken.

12 This is when they were -- had finished and
13 I think they were just beginning to bring back in dirt.
14 Because I think they were filling that northern end
15 there.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think they may be
17 excavating.

18 MS. FANELLI: May be excavating still.
19 Some of that was the concrete that was there, yeah.

20 And then here they are backfilling
21 definitely. You can see the fabric going down. Yeah.
22 So if you look at the dust bowl, there's no big pile
23 left.

24 BAPR. I'm hoping that we'll have a secure
25 site by the end of this month.

1 This is -- I had to put this little 9-2013
2 on there. Ryan, he didn't reset the date, and, and so it
3 looks like 2007, so now it's going to be confusing.

4 This is obviously at the toe of landfill E
5 and they're digging out the material with their little
6 dump trucks.

7 Here you can see the hand work in some of
8 the root zones. It's actually what has been fairly
9 difficult because of the trees.

10 Even though we did remove several trees
11 before we started, the ones that were left were the ones
12 identified by the planning group, Michael Boland's Group
13 to save.

14 The backfill soil is -- is actually 10th
15 and Market, but -- that might be 10th and Market soil
16 that we had brought in. Because we only have the roots
17 exposed for 24 hours.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: But that's primarily
19 colma you're digging out.

20 MS. FANELLI: It's a mixture of colma
21 dune. It is fill, mostly fill soil, native materials.

22 You can see in this picture all these
23 bricks. So we found actually more extensive fill, and I
24 think the issue here is it's just a full for the building
25 that's flopped over.

1 So our satisfaction boundaries changed a
2 little bit and we're chased a little closer to the
3 building.

4 I don't have a photo of it, but areas
5 underneath the redwoods, we have not really been able to
6 effectively remove this kind of debris from beneath the
7 redwood roots, and so we're leaving that material at the
8 redwoods because the whole point of the cleanup was for
9 eco and protection of the redwoods.

10 So they'll be a little bit of future if and
11 when those trees are changed or something else happens,
12 but -- that we'll have to handle, but I don't think it's
13 a huge amount of material.

14 But all of this we're doing our best to get
15 out. So I'm not sure where they are in confirmation
16 sampling, but we'll see what we're actually left with
17 when we do our confirmation samples.

18 In this area, I know we can get pretty deep
19 and get below the fill soils into native soils and we're
20 backfilling with the 10th and Market soil.

21 MS. BLUM: 2nd and Market, that's that
22 humongous high-rise?

23 MS. FANELLI: Yeah.

24 MS. BLUM: Thousand apartment deal.

25 MS. FANELLI: And Mountain Lake, you know,

1 we're working there. We're hoping that the sediment is
2 all out and the bags are filled by the end of --
3 consolidated by the end of October.

4 We also have the additional north arm
5 material out. They'll be some consolidation and all of
6 that material may be in November and site restoration
7 following, but right now our schedule's showing us at
8 being out of there in December.

9 And we do have some challenges. The north
10 arm's going to be a little challenging.

11 But I think in the next several weeks,
12 there'll be the dredging from adjacent to Highway 1. So
13 you might see the riprap, the rock on barges.

14 They'll be taking out the sediment and then
15 putting riprap back in and then putting riprap back in to
16 make sure that we don't destabilize the slope.

17 The highway's pretty stable, but we don't
18 want to lose that little wedge of soil that comes off the
19 edge of there into the lake.

20 MS. BLUM: I think on 10th and Market
21 soil, was that mostly sand?

22 MS. FANELLI: It's mostly sand. It was
23 very sandy. It doesn't have a lot of finds in it.

24 And that's it. That's my presentation.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any

1 questions for Eileen?

2 The Baker Beach 1A and 2, any surprises?

3 Anything interesting? UXO --

4 MS. FANELLI: No UXO.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Bones, you know,
6 anything?

7 MS. FANELLI: A lot of historical features
8 at 1A.

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was discovery --
10 rediscovery of some Battery West features that were not
11 known to exist. So one of the guys hit some part of the
12 wall.

13 There were also some historic surface
14 drainage features that were buried at shallow depth which
15 no one had anticipated to find --

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Mm-hmm

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: -- existed.

18 So for the most part, those features are
19 all -- were all preserved. They weren't destroyed in
20 discovery and reburied.

21 Some of the features will be re-exposed
22 when the conservancy comes in next year to do the fair
23 work.

24 Some of them we'd like to re-expose. We're
25 not sure whether it's going to be feasible to do that or

1 not.

2 So in a varying way, if we can recover
3 them, expose them and interpret them, we will.

4 These have been buried for over a hundred
5 years. So it's pretty exciting. They're in pretty good
6 shape.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Brick?

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: Much like you see at
9 Battery East, brick walls.

10 MS. FANELLI: We had a full-time
11 archeologist out there and I know he worked real closely
12 with Leo and Steve at the Park Service.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: The extent of
14 contamination, any surprises there or --

15 MS. FANELLI: I think we took a little
16 extra material from both sites.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah, because you had the
18 edges defined at 1A. You went a little deeper at a few
19 spots, and their degree two went further north that had
20 been proposed.

21 But it was fairly easy to see, so it's much
22 closer to that lone cypress and the parking lot now, and
23 they had one spot where it wasn't very well-defined and
24 it went deeper.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: That's pretty good.

1 Okay. Any more questions or comments on
2 the quarterly report?

3 Thank you, Eileen.

4 Moving on to topic 5, RAB final report.
5 Julie Cheever and Jan Monaghan.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: She ratted out on here.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: She's traveling --
8 where was it?

9 MS. MONAGHAN: She's cruising the Black
10 Sea.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Cruising the Black
12 Sea right now. A pretty good excuse.

13 Jan, do you want to start it off?

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Pretty good report here.
15 We met on August the 6th at Julie's house, and Mark's
16 done a lot of work on the format and things and we
17 basically had set up -- the report's going to look like a
18 typical remediation report.

19 These are the components that we've
20 identified so far. Purpose and description of the
21 Presidio RAB, history, including the formation of the
22 RABs, years -- and then the Presidio RAB. Years with the
23 Army and years with the Presidio Trust.

24 RAB contributions to the cleanup process.
25 Presidio RAB innovations compared to other RABs, things

1 we've done differently than other RABs.

2 One of the sections will be effectiveness
3 as a community group, and then the last piece is the
4 Declaration of Adjournment, which is kind of a formal
5 thing where you talk about what you're going to -- why
6 we're disbanding the RAB and what other things we might
7 want to be involved in or be interested in in the future.

8 And then the report will be augmented by
9 maps, photographs and appendices, including the roster
10 and some of the other things, our bylaws and things,
11 things that other RABs will be interested in. So we
12 thought we would put that in.

13 MS. FANELLI: Sounds good.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: And so Mark took a shot at
15 the roster, the things we're missing 1995, 2007 and 2011.
16 So I'm looking for those.

17 MS. FANELLI: Did you e-mail Denise Fraga?
18 You know Denise Fraga. She might have it somewhere.

19 MS. BLUM: I think there was at some
20 point, Jan, where there was long periods where the roster
21 didn't change at all. So that might explain.

22 MS. MONAGHAN: We at least had an annual
23 update of the roster.

24 MS. BLUM: I'm not sure we always did.

25 MS. GEE: E-mails or --

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Denise would be a good
2 thing. Even in '95 before the Trust, she would have
3 still been the one doing it for the Army.

4 MS. FANELLI: Oh, really?

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think so.

6 MS. BLUM: So internal.

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: It should be in the
8 library because -- for '95.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: So if I strike out in my
10 boxes, I will go to the library and I'll e-mail Denise.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: And if both of those
12 avenues flake out, there's a slight chance we might have
13 them, but I think the other two venues will be easier.

14 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. Very good. Thanks.

15 And the next meeting is October the 1st at
16 6:30, and it's either going to be at Julie's house again
17 or my house, and everyone's invited.

18 MS. BLUM: Just as an offering, with
19 regard to all the work that Mark did on the unidentified
20 sites, I think that would be -- under the RAB
21 contributions to clean up would be an important thing to
22 include, because it was a personal effort and a lot of
23 time spent in documenting those and researching and then
24 documenting those sites.

25 That was really extraordinary, over a

1 hundred, wasn't it? I think you said more than that.

2 MS. FANELLI: I think it's 230 if I can
3 remember, on the list.

4 MS. BLUM: So that went a long way, I
5 think, to cleaning up.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Thank you.

7 MS. BLUM: Adding to the --

8 MS. MONAGHAN: I think that's in there.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Independent
10 historical research.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: Mm-hmm.

12 MS. BLUM: Lobos Creek.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Contribution or
14 something.

15 MS. BLUM: Okay.

16 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. So we'll --

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Keep working on it.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: In October, we'll
19 probably have a first draft, I think. It depends on how
20 Julie --

21 MS. MONAGHAN: She said she would get her
22 work done.

23 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And we were going
24 to check on the transcripts.

25 MS. BLUM: I haven't put that on my

1 priority list. If we're going to have a rough draft by
2 October --

3 MS. FANELLI: I think they're almost all
4 in our library. Barbara Janice has copies.

5 MS. BLUM: I'll call Barbara first.

6 MS. FANELLI: I think we'll be referencing
7 them in our kind of closure document, anyway, so to the
8 extent you don't want to enumerate them, we'll be
9 enumerating them, anyway, that we had these meetings.

10 I don't think I'm going to be appending
11 them. If you want to append them, then you can go ahead
12 and do that.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We were going to
14 see if they were in electronic format.

15 MS. FANELLI: There's some. I don't know
16 how -- that's a question for Mark, when the electronic
17 formats started coming.

18 THE REPORTER: Years.

19 MS. FANELLI: It's been years, but the
20 early ones are not. They're just hard copy.

21 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: She was going to
22 see what's available.

23 MS. FANELLI: Barbara might have -- I know
24 Barbara was trying to make PDFs of many of our hard copy
25 documents, so she might have done that. She had some

1 interns working for her.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I'm putting
3 together sort of a to-do list of items like the roster --
4 I mean, the charter bylaws.

5 Is there a signed --

6 MS. MONAGHAN: I have a copy of it.
7 Julian delivered it to my house.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

9 MS. MONAGHAN: I have a signed final.

10 MS. BLUM: Did you talk about adding --
11 you're always interested and I am -- the photographs, the
12 before and the after.

13 Did we ever make a provision for any of
14 that incorporation into the document?

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: No, not yet.

16 MS. BLUM: Which would make it a little
17 more interesting.

18 MS. MONAGHAN: But the question is how --
19 how will this be published? We're not going to publish a
20 document. It will be on the Trust website, I think. I
21 don't know.

22 MS. BLUM: Maybe we could ask Eileen for
23 some pictures. You must have a huge library of pictures.

24 MS. FANELLI: We're going to be doing our
25 own report that will document compliance with the Consent

1 Agreement and the Water Board order.

2 There will be two different documents on
3 our part, and we'll be including select photographs for
4 each of the sites that are listed.

5 MS. BLUM: Okay.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We were going to
7 ask for group photographs of the RAB if those folks
8 happen to be somewhere.

9 MS. FANELLI: I know there's a couple from
10 the past.

11 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah. There isn't very
12 many.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: There isn't very
14 many.

15 So that kind of leads me to the question,
16 you know, we finish all this up and this is not a vanity
17 project.

18 So we're trying to figure out what will
19 happen. Will it go on the Trust Remediation website as
20 our -- our contribution to that or --

21 MS. FANELLI: I think --

22 MS. MONAGHAN: Will it be a subset of your
23 document?

24 MS. FANELLI: I had said before that I
25 will reference it, and I definitely -- I'm not backing

1 off on that.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: If it's an appendix or
3 somehow part of your document, then it will go up on the
4 state's website.

5 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Envirostor.

6 MS. FANELLI: DTSC could put it on
7 their --

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: It will go up as a
9 deliverable from you, it will go on Envirostor.

10 MS. FANELLI: To the extent it's an
11 appendix to our document, yes.

12 MS. BLUM: Where would it be posted? DTSC
13 or Envirostor?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: It will probably go to
15 the Trust.

16 MS. BLUM: It definitely should go to the
17 archive.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: We'll get a copy, which
19 will ultimately get into our archives, too.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. And it makes sense
21 to make it only electronic.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: However Eileen's report
23 is delivered. It should include electronic. Paper is
24 more permanent in many archivists' view.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: I've heard that story.

1 MS. FANELLI: We have an issue with
2 putting things up on our web page just so that you're
3 aware of it. And that is that it has to be processed so
4 that it's ADA accessible, and we have to -- we pay extra,
5 for example, when we have a RAP that's posted on our web
6 page.

7 We actually have to have it processed so
8 that it's ADA accessible. That is an issue that I'll
9 have to look into.

10 MS. MONAGHAN: What does that mean?

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: It has to do with the
12 size of the font, contrast of the front. It has to be
13 readable. Someone who is sight impaired may have a
14 computer that can read documents, some of the imagery has
15 to have narrative description attached to it.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's a whole section
18 of federal code that describes what compliant documents
19 contain.

20 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay.

21 MS. BLUM: Sorry. If there's a cost
22 involved to comply with these various regulations,
23 including whatever the archives might require, would that
24 come out of remediation funds or --

25 MS. FANELLI: I don't know. I'll need to

1 check into that.

2 MS. BLUM: Okay.

3 MS. FANELLI: I -- I don't know exactly
4 what we pay to have reports made accessible, but I know
5 the Trust has been pushing to make sure that they are a
6 hundred percent in compliance and not putting too much
7 out on their web page.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: If it's not posted on the
9 public web page, the compliance requirements are
10 different.

11 MS. FANELLI: It definitely will be in our
12 archives.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: It seems to me font --
14 we're going to do a black and white document.

15 MR. ULLENSVANG: There's a number of fine
16 points to it, font and -- I know that there are a lot of
17 issues. I don't know what all the issues are.

18 MS. FANELLI: I'll find out.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Envirostor doesn't
20 have this document.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe their posting
22 documents have been submitted. It's also a state website
23 versus a federal, so the rules might be slightly
24 different.

25 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I guess personally,

1 I would be more interested in having it on Envirostor
2 just because it seems like it's permanent.

3 MS. FANELLI: It will be in our library
4 and we do keep electronic copies. it just won't be
5 posted on the week page.

6 If it's posted, it will be posted that it's
7 available.

8 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And how long there
9 will be a remediation section on the web page.

10 MS. FANELLI: I don't know that, to be
11 honest with you.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: That helps me think about
13 it.

14 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Let's see. I have
15 a few other things, too. Some sort of maps, like this
16 map here on the bottom.

17 Do you have that in electronic format? I
18 know it will be in your report, too, but if there was
19 some general overview map on where the sites are.

20 MS. BLUM: We have zillions over the
21 years.

22 MS. FANELLI: You know, I've struggled
23 with one map that shows everything because I haven't been
24 able actually find one map that nicely shows everything
25 because of the variation in size and what it is you're

1 looking at.

2 So the way we're approaching it is not so
3 much at one single map, but for each of our sites, we're
4 sort of doing independent maps that are key to the larger
5 area because it's -- I have been frustrated -- we can
6 make a general map like this, but I'm sure you'll find
7 cause to complain that it's not complete or it doesn't
8 have this on it or doesn't have that on it.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: This is just
10 general, so I think that will be fine.

11 MS. FANELLI: We have a copy of that and I
12 can get you guys a PDF.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: I don't want to go
14 into too much detail on a site.

15 MS. BLUM: Sam Berman had a wonderful map
16 by EK whatever that I had copied for my reference when I
17 first started which I found very, very helpful because it
18 outlined the size of the known.

19 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Probably out of
20 date by now.

21 MS. BLUM: Probably.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: That's not unlike that
23 map there.

24 MS. BLUM: The bottom one?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah.

1 MS. FANELLI: This is a map by Hans in our
2 GIS group. So I would give you a Hans map.

3 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Great. So October
4 1st, we'll keep pursuing this.

5 I guess I wanted to talk a little bit about
6 the last part of the report or RAB sunseting,
7 adjournment, I guess it is.

8 It seems like something that we should
9 start talking about as a group now, right? I mean,
10 should I start bringing it up as a topic on the RAB
11 agenda?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: You might need to rally
13 the troops to get up to a quorum, because I assume that
14 there will need to be some sort of vote; not that you
15 would adjourn that date of the vote, but the RAB as a
16 group votes to support an adjournment at the future time
17 that you're proposing.

18 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: It's sort of set up
19 for the May 14th, 2014 RAB meeting which would be the
20 vote to adjourn.

21 MS. FANELLI: Is the 14th a second --

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't have a May
23 calendar.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: I do.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: May 14th is a Wednesday.

1 So it would be May 13th.

2 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: May 13th, mm-hmm.

3 So that's a pretty important thing. It
4 just needs like it needs to be started vetting.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: Better to plan it out
6 now.

7 MS. MONAGHAN: I've been thinking that we
8 probably need to send a letter to our current roster and
9 tell them where we are with these things and ask if they
10 are interested in participating in the closing of the RAB
11 or if they would like to resign, then we can kind of get
12 down to where our roster needs to be in order to get a
13 quorum.

14 Does that make sense?

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah. It makes
16 sense. That's a good idea.

17 MS. BLUM: Or being proactive, couldn't
18 you tell people they've been resigned since they've
19 missed 47 meetings in a row?

20 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We can.

21 MS. MONAGHAN: We could, but nicer just to
22 do it the other way, right?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: That way people can come
24 back one last time and say they've participated.

25 MS. MONAGHAN: They may want to.

1 MS. FANELLI: I think maybe plan -- see
2 how many will come and I can see, then, if there's a --
3 get what's available, a larger room and make it --

4 MS. BLUM: A birthday cake.

5 MS. FANELLI: A more formal kind of.

6 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah, sure.

7 MS. FANELLI: You know, maybe there will
8 be a presentation on your report as part of that.

9 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: A signing.

10 MS. FANELLI: A signing, yeah. Good
11 point.

12 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Great.

13 MS. MONAGHAN: We're always looking for a
14 party.

15 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Yeah.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: Okay. Any public comment?
18 Seeing none, action items and agenda items.

19 So I had one DTSC in October?

20 MS. FANELLI: I'm thinking that they
21 might, you know, and I would encourage them because our
22 plan is to push them to issue the fillsite 6B document or
23 whatever -- my understanding is that they're going to
24 issue a notice that they're going to adopt the language
25 control.

1 So the opportunity would be to do a
2 presentation and discuss it before that -- that notice
3 comes out.

4 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: We'd like to see
5 them again.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: Mm-hmm.

7 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And just sort of a
8 project update.

9 MS. FANELLI: Sure. Most definitely.

10 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: And the final
11 report.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: Yeah.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay. Any other
14 agenda items or action items?

15 You guys had a pretty good tour last month.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: It was really interesting I
17 thought. Windy.

18 MS. BLUM: Major land changes, just so
19 different. Sweeping views, really.

20 MS. KRAMER: Was that because of the brush
21 removal?

22 MS. BLUM: Yes, and the grading.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: The earth form has
24 changed. I notice the most dramatic change, opening the
25 vegetation and clearing it all out. Really -- very broad

1 vista. You begin to see what the folks there manning the
2 guns would have seen.

3 MS. GEE: And also to see the artifacts of
4 the old wall and the drainage, because that will be
5 covered -- covered up again, right?

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: It will be. The whole
7 thing will be re-exposed, but at least in the short-term,
8 it will be re-covered?

9 MS. BLUM: Hand work one stone at a time.
10 Quite remarkable.

11 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Okay.

12 MS. MONAGHAN: I like tours.

13 FACILITATOR YOUNGKIN: Any other comments?
14 Seeing none, meeting adjourned.

15 (The meeting concluded at 8:08 PM).

16 ---o0o---

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
5 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
6 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
7 full, true and complete record of said matter.

8

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
13 action.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this
_____ day of _____,
2013.

MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527